DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 447 PS 021 944

AUTHOR Flood, Marilyn J., Ed.
TITLE Where They Stand: A Digest of Organizational Policies on Child Care and Education.
INSTITUTION Child Care Action Campaign, New York, NY.
PUB DATE Mar 93
NOTE 146p.
AVAILABLE FROM Child Care Action Campaign, 330 Seventh Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10001 (members, $15; non-members, $25).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Abstracts; Agency Cooperation; *Day Care; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Family Role; Government Role; *National Organizations; *Partnerships in Education; Policy Analysis; *Position Papers; Private Sector; Public Policy; School Role
IDENTIFIERS Policy Issues

ABSTRACT

This digest summarizes the specific policies and recommendations of 45 national educational and public policy organizations in the areas of education reform, early childhood education, quality child care, and collaborative approaches to the care and education of children. The major portion of the document is divided into sections highlighting specific organizations. Each section briefly describes the organization, provides abstracts of recent publications or policy statements on specific educational and day care policies, and lists recommendations made by the organization. An opening summary notes that most organizations agreed that: (1) all children should have access to early childhood programs; (2) schools must collaborate with other agencies to deliver ancillary services such as day care and health care; (3) parent involvement must be encouraged; (4) the private sector should play an important role in education and child care; (5) schools must play a larger role in providing day care; (6) all programs should use developmentally appropriate curriculum; and (7) federal and state governments must take a more active role in initiating, implementing, and financing educational and day care programs. Four appendixes provide a chart of organizations' policy positions, a bibliography of organization publications, a list of the 45 organizations with addresses and telephone numbers, and a list of additional resource organizations. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED 365 447

Where They Stand:

A Digest of Organizational Policies on Child Care and Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn J. Flood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 021944

CHILD CARE AND EDUCATION: THE CRITICAL C·O·N·N·E·C·T·I·O·N

CHILD CARE ACTION CAMPAIGN
March 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Child Care Action Campaign

The Child Care Action Campaign (CCAC), a national, non-profit coalition of individuals and organizations, was formed in 1983 to respond to our nation's child care crisis. Believing that child care can no longer be viewed solely as a women's issue, CCAC has taken the lead in making quality child care both a bottom-line economic issue and a fundamental component of education reform.

CCAC's original research and groundbreaking publications are key elements in a national public education campaign to change attitudes about how our country cares for and educates its children and to provide parents, policymakers and businesses with the resources they need to both understand the problem and work for change.

CCAC's materials have helped tens of thousands of parents deal with the daunting task of recognizing and finding quality child care and advocating improvements in their communities. CCAC is at the forefront of helping small businesses establish child care assistance programs for employees, and has provided vital leadership in bringing together the public and private sectors to develop partnerships for financing quality care.

CCAC continues to affect public policy by providing cogent analysis, expert testimony and technical assistance to government leaders and policymakers on child care and family issues. CCAC's 500-member National Advisory Panel, comprised of the nation's top child care experts, advocates and practitioners is a potent force working to improve the lives of all of America's children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Where They Stand:

A Digest of Organizational Policies on Child Care and Education

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements i

Editor's Note ii

Introduction iii

Part I: Analysis of National Organizations' Policy Positions vii

Part II: Digest Of Publications xi

American Association of School Administrators 12
American Federation of Teachers 14
Association for Childhood Education International 16
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 17
Business Roundtable 19
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 21
Center for the Future of Children 23
Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning 25
Child Care Employee Project 28
Children's Defense Fund 30
Child Welfare League of America 32
Committee for Economic Development 34
Conference Board 40
Council of Chief State School Officers 42
Council of Governors' Policy Advisors 46
Council of the Great City Schools 47
Education Commission of the States 49
Families and Work Institute 54
Family Resource Coalition 55
Institute for Educational Leadership 57
National Alliance for Business: Center for Excellence in Education 58
National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies 59
National Association for the Education of Young Children 63
National Association of Elementary School Principals 65
National Association of State Boards of Education 67
National Black Child Development Institute 70
National Child Care Association 72
National Coalition for an Urban Children's Agenda 73
National Commission on Children 75
National Conference of State Legislatures 77
National Council of Jewish Women 79
National Education Association 80
National Education Goals Panel 83

National Elementary School Center 84
National Governors' Association 86
National Head Start Association 91
National League of Cities 92
National PTA 94
National School Boards Association 96
Project Home Safe 100
School-Age Child Care Project 101
Southern Early Childhood Association 105
United Way of America 107
U.S. Chamber of Commerce: Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education 109
U.S. Department of Education 110

Appendix I: Chart of National Organizations' Policy Positions 113

Appendix II: Bibliography of Publications 115

Appendix III: Organizations Included in Policy Digest 123

Appendix IV: Additional Resource Organizations 129

Acknowledgements

Marilyn Flood, Project Director for "Child Care and Education: The Critical Connection," edited this policy digest and guided its publication. Kristin Andersen, Program Associate, managed the research and annotation preparation. The Child Care Action Campaign (CCAC) thanks them, staff member Diane Foy and former staff member Julie Kay, who assisted with the research, staff member Dolores Schaefer, who helped with design, and education consultant Anne Mitchell, who provided advice throughout the publication process. The following interns also made significant contributions to this digest: Lisa Grumet, Janine Handfus and Alice Mangan.

We would like to give special thanks to Elinor Guggenheimer, CCAC Founding President and first Chair of the Planning Committee, for her guidance and leadership during the initial phases of this project. We also want to thank Dee Topol, CCAC Board Member and current Chair of the Planning Committee, for her commitment to this project.

We are also very grateful to the A.L. Mailman Family Foundation, American Express Foundation, AT&T Foundation, Citibank, N.A., Dayton Hudson Foundation on befalf of Mervyn's and Target Stores, E.I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company, Herman Goldman Foundation, The Johnson Foundation, Primerica Foundation, Time Warner Inc. and Work/Family Directions for their generous support of our work.

Richard B. Stolley
CCAC President

Barbara Reisman
Executive Director

Editor's Note

Our research for this policy digest expanded considerably as we delved into the issues of education reform and early childhood education. At the outset, we had identified 25 national organizations that had issued publications or policy statements about quality child care, education restructuring, collaboration among service providers or comprehensive systems of care and education. By the end, our policy digest included 45 groups and 89 publications. This stunning array of statements and recommendations about the future of America's children is a testament to the importance of these issues to a diverse and growing constituency and a challenge to all of us to act on these recommendations.

Although we believe we made a careful literature search, there are undoubtedly other organizations that have issued policy statements on these critical issues. I apologize to groups we omitted and encourage them to send us their materials.

Each digest entry summarizes a report's treatment of the specific topics of education reform, collaboration, quality child care and early childhood education; we have not condensed entire publications. I hope our annotations accurately reflect each organization's positions. In no case does the inclusion of a publication constitute an endorsement by the Child Care Action Campaign of the organization or its policy position.

Although the digest is now published, our search for information continues. We would appreciate copies of relevant publications and information about initiatives to connect child care and education. Sharing knowledge and resources is a first step in a long journey toward a comprehensive system of child care and education.

Marilyn J. Flood, Esq.
Editor

Introduction

America's children are at risk. A record number of them are living in poverty. Infant mortality is on the rise. Twenty-five percent of all children fail to finish high school. School performance is declining by almost every measure. Our future as a nation is jeopardized by our failure to care for and educate our children.

One response to this crisis focuses on reforming the school system. Another seeks to improve child care, health and social services to very young children. A third approach focuses on family preservation through parent training and family support programs. None of these alone is an adequate response to the crisis.

What is needed is a new commitment to the care and education of America's children and a comprehensive system that addresses their needs.

A critical barrier exists to developing comprehensive services for children and families. Policymakers frequently operate under the assumption that early childhood education and child care are two separate processes with different purposes and goals: "The purpose of early childhood education is generally viewed as something profitable for society because it helps poor children succeed better in school. Child care, on the other hand, is often seen more as a benefit to parents, rather than children, so that the parents can go to work." (The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education, Committee for Economic Development, 1991)

In fact, children begin learning at birth, not at age five or six when they enter the formal school system. The first five years of a child's life are the most crucial to his or her development. We risk a great deal by ignoring children's needs for both nurturing and education, and by hoping that the current fragmented system of child care in the United States will be enough to prepare children for school.

Many of our children now enter the formal school system at a terrible disadvantage. According to a 1991 survey of kindergarten teachers, 35 percent of the nation's children are not ready for school. (Ready to Learn--A Mandate for the Nation, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1991) If we do not adopt a comprehensive approach to the care and education of children, we cannot expect to meet the first of the six National Education Goals adopted by the National Governors' Association and President Bush in 1990: "By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn." (America 2000: An Education Strategy, U.S. Department of Education, 1991)

Failure to prepare children properly for school also has an enormous impact on our economy. An estimated 23 million adults are illiterate. Businesses in the U.S. spend about $30 billion per year on remedial education for their employees. (America's Choice: High Skills/Low Wages!, National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990) Workforce 2000 needs to be better educated and equipped with a higher level of technical skills. That education must begin before children enter school.

To date, reform efforts focusing on preschool education have targeted at-risk three- and four-year-olds, primarily with in-school, part-day programs. Head Start is the premier example of this approach, and the most successful and widely known. For the most part, to be eligible for Head Start, a child must live in a family with income below the poverty level. Moreover, the program currently serves only 28 percent of those children who are poor enough to qualify, and in 94 percent of cases is a part-day, part-year program. (Head Start: The Nation's Pride, A Nation's Challenge, National Head Start Association, 1990)

Convinced that the barrier between the care and education of children must be eliminated, the Child Care Action Campaign (CCAC) has launched "Child Care and Education: The Critical Connection," a multi-year national public education campaign. This project has four major objectives: refocus public discussion so that the existing dichotomy between early childhood education and child care is replaced by the concept that quality child care and education are part of the same process; ensure that the child care needs of children and parents are addressed in the education reform agenda; make this new vision of a continuous system of child care and education a broadly supported public policy; and develop a set of guidelines for states and local communities that provides the essential components of any comprehensive system of child care and education.

Many organizations of educators, policy analysts, researchers, elected officials, child care advocates and business leaders have seriously considered these critical issues and published well-articulated positions on the importance of early childhood education in a child's development; the preeminent need to achieve the school-readiness goal; the best way to restructure schools; the significant role child care must play in a new education system; and successful approaches to collaboration among educators, advocates, parents, government officials and corporate leaders to improve the lives of America's children and families. These statements, summarized in this policy digest, represent an emerging consensus about the need for action and a guide to its direction.

The annotations herein focus on an organization's specific policies and recommendations in the areas of education reform, early childhood education, quality child care and collaborative approaches to the care and education of children. The entries are not condensations of entire reports. After an overview, which analyzes the similarities and differences in the organizations' policy positions, the digest is arranged alphabetically by organization.

For readers who want a panoramic view, we have included a chart (Appendix I) displaying issues such as financing, quality and school-age child care, and the organizations that treated these issues in the publications we reviewed. The digest's other appendices include a bibliography of publications summarized and other relevant reports issued by each organization, a list of the organizations profiled with their addresses and phone numbers and a list of additional resource organizations.

The Child Care Action Campaign publishes this digest to move the national dialogue about child care and education forward and to provide a context for action. We are realistic about the enormous effort required to restructure the system of care and education of American children, but we are also optimistic that such dramatic change is possible. We are in the process of developing an action agenda that incorporates recommendations of the groups represented herein about the essential components of a comprehensive system that will benefit children, parents, employers and the general public. After a national conference in April 1993, where we will debate and seek consensus on a final set of guidelines, we will work to implement a strategic plan of action.

On the national level, we are committed to working with the organizations in this digest and other concerned groups to develop and implement policies supporting quality education and care for children and effective services for families. In concert, we can press for national policies rather than demonstration projects and for full funding for children's services rather than paltry appropriations. In coalition, we can move from eloquent rhetoric to a better reality for America's children.

PART I: ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS' POLICY POSITIONS

Part I: Analysis of National Organizations' Policy Positions

The year 2000 looms large in the education field and ever closer. In a special issue on the millenium, Time Magazine refers to it as "essentially an event of the imagination" and "a projected launch platform for humankind's most ambitious, far-reaching projects." (Time Magazine, Fall 1992)

President Bush and the Governors used the year 2000 in just this visionary way at the 1989 Education Summit where they agreed on six National Education Goals to be accomplished by the millenium and charged the National Education Goals Panel with measuring progress toward achieving these goals. Since then, in addition to the Panel's annual "report cards," the Goals have evoked a torrent of articles in the print media and education journals. Many of the publications in this digest were released after the Education Summit, as education organizations grappled with their response to the Goals and the underlying issue of education restructuring.

For the purposes of this policy digest, we focused specifically on recommendations national organizations made about achieving Goal 1: "By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn." We believe that Goal 1 is the key to achieving the other five Goals. The years between birth and kindergarten are crucial to a child's development and school success.

Other organizations whose reports are annotated herein issued their reports because of a commitment to quality child care and support services for families. In some cases, these groups focus on ways to link the child care system with education and other social service systems; in other cases, the organizations make specific recommendations for improving quality, financing child care, staff training and development, and early childhood curricula. These recommendations echo our concern about the quality of child care and the critical need for a new, comprehensive approach to the care and education of children.

The organizations represented in this policy digest are very diverse--advocates, research institutions, membership associations of educators, child care professionals, and alliances of business leaders. This diversity engenders viewpoints and recommendations that are understandably divergent. Yet we discovered core areas of agreement about critical issues and recommendations for change, including the following:

- **Universality.** All children should have access to quality early childhood programs, with "at-risk" (usually defined as low-income) children having top priority.

- **Collaboration.** Schools must collaborate with other agencies, including child care providers, to deliver services that children and their families need and are not presently receiving.

- **Parental Involvement.** All agencies serving children and families, including schools and child care providers, must encourage the input of parents into program design and implementation, as well as offer parents educational and supportive services.

- **Role of the Private Sector.** The private sector, both business and voluntary organizations, has an important contribution to make to education reform and quality child care.

- **Role of the Schools.** Because schools are playing an increasingly larger role in preschool education, they must be restructured not only to accommodate the needs of school-age children but also those of younger children and their families.

- **Program Content.** Curricula used in all education and care settings must be developmentally appropriate and culturally sensitive.

- **School-Age Child Care.** Schools must recognize their responsibilities in the area of before- and after-school care for school-age children and develop quality programs in cooperation with community agencies.

- **Government Policies.** State and federal education and child care policies must be changed to encourage innovation and performance-based outcomes.

- **Government Financing.** Government at all levels must provide funds for efforts to restructure education, increase the supply of quality child care and develop comprehensive, integrated service-delivery systems.

One theme in particular emerged over and over in the publications annotated herein. Collaboration among public and private agencies is necessary for effective, efficient delivery of services to children and families. The current social welfare system is rigid and fragmented, by its very structure dividing the problems of children and families into distinct categories. The Institute for Educational Leadership describes the effect of such a system: "Children and families in such a system bounce like pinballs in a pinball machine--from problem to problem, from one agency to the next--with little cooperation and follow up." (What It Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families with Comprehensive Services, Institute for Educational Leadership, 1991)

Acknowledging the obstacles to successful collaboration, organizations believe that working collaboratively, education, child care, health and a variety of other family-support and social service agencies can better provide for the interrelated physical, emotional and intellectual needs of young children. An important by-product of such collaboration is the elimination of overlap and duplication of services, resulting in substantial savings in administrative costs and increased resources for direct services. As the National Governors'

Association bluntly and presciently warned in 1986: "If present national and state trends continue, cooperation among those who provide services for preschool children will be the only method of providing comprehensive child development programs....There will never be enough money to go around." (Time for Results, National Governors' Association, 1986)

Although most of the organizations in this digest support a collaborative approach, their visions differ as to what services should be linked and whether these services should be provided through a school-based, school-linked or alternate model. Those groups favoring a school-based model argue that the public school is a visible and universal institution, located in every community. Legally mandated to educate children, schools are the place children go to 180 days a year or thereabouts for at least 10 years. Schools also have trained staff, space and a tradition of providing some additional health and recreational services for children.

Some groups propose a school-linked, one-stop-shopping model with the school one among a number of service providers working collaboratively to provide comprehensive services to children and families. In such a model, the school may provide some services directly, make space available for other groups to deliver services at the school and act as a broker for other resources for families and children through a resource-and-referral system.

Most groups that recognize the increasing role of public schools in early childhood education recommend "safeguards" such as: schools should be reorganized to include an early childhood unit; staff must be trained in child development; the traditional elementary school curriculum cannot be pushed down into lower and lower age ranges of children; curricula and staff must be sensitive to cultural and religious differences; parent input must be welcomed; non-school-based child care options for parents must continue to be available; and schools should help coordinate, but not necessarily operate, children's and family services.

Some groups advocate for a community-based, comprehensive service-delivery model. In this model, community-based programs would provide health care, child care and family-support services, with such programs linked to schools that offer developmentally appropriate teaching and assessment and strengthened parental involvement.

Far too few organizations, however, are calling for the elimination of barriers between child care and education, our goal in our multi-year project "Child Care and Education: The Critical Connection." We are heartened by the 14 organizations whose expressed policy is that child care is an educational setting where children can grow cognitively, physically and emotionally, rather than a babysitting function benefiting parents. We believe it is vitally important that more organizations subscribe to the view that the care and education of children are the same process and must be delivered through a comprehensive system fostering the growth of children into healthy, productive adults.

We hope that the publication of this policy digest and the other components of our project will encourage consensus and promote collaboration among the organizations in this digest, as well as among public and private agencies at all levels of American government. The policies articulated here are admirable, but they must be implemented to improve the lives of America's children and families. If all children start school ready to learn by the year 2000, the millenium will not be merely a "temporal horizon line" but the beginning of a new and better future for America's children.

PART II: DIGEST OF PUBLICATIONS

American Association of School Administrators

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA), representing more than 18,000 educational leaders from the U.S., Canada and other countries, provides administrators with new knowledge and skills and researches and develops public positions on education policy. Founded in 1865.

Beyond the Schools: How Schools & Communities Must Collaborate to Solve the Problems Facing America's Youth **(published in collaboration with the National Association of State Boards of Education, 1991).** In this report, which outlines a set of strategies designed to improve the nation's schools, AASA argues that a key part of the approach is providing early childhood education and child care programs that have appropriate, strong educational components. Because a child's early years are critical to later educational success, prenatal care and programs to enhance the readiness of children for school will help reduce or eliminate many problems that might occur later in a child's life. AASA suggests several steps school board members and administrators can take to ensure that quality early childhood programs are a part of their community: 1) convene a community-wide task force to study early childhood education and child care needs and outline needed improvements; 2) mobilize support for the funds needed to establish and maintain early childhood education programs; 3) assess the prenatal and infant health care needs of the community and gather support for professionals who can serve those needs; 4) explore the possibility of providing community and social services for children and families within school facilities; and 5) develop information packets for new parents on child development, parenting and the community's schools. □

Some Points to Make When You Talk About the Summit **(1990).** This booklet, designed for school leaders, is a brief outline of the National Education Goals. AASA supports the first goal—by the year 2000, all children should begin school ready to learn—because problems leading to school failure often begin early in a child's life. The report emphasizes the critical importance of early childhood education for the increasing numbers of young children growing up in worsening economic and social conditions; however, AASA also recognizes that because more than two thirds of the children in the U.S. spend part of the day in the care of people other than their parents, getting children ready for school is an issue for all families. AASA argues that quality, developmentally appropriate care is essential in the early years to give children the self-esteem and maturity needed for success in school. □

Early Childhood Education and Child Care: Challenges and Opportunities for America's Public Schools **(1989).** This report discusses the role of the public schools in providing needed early childhood education and child care programs, gives background on critical issues community and school leaders should address when considering the role of the public schools, and outlines basic steps school systems should take when implementing early childhood programs.

To provide quality early childhood programs in the public schools and other sites, the report suggests leaders at the local, state and federal level consider the following recommendations for action:

- **At the local level.** Design a program that meets the needs of the community and monitor changes that might affect these needs; make parents primary partners in the preschool experience; recognize the needs of children and families in poverty; hire trained and experienced staff; establish ties with local businesses and other organizations to further child development programs; ensure

"Social and economic conditions that affect children and young people continue to worsen....Schools cannot deal with these problems single-handedly."

***Beyond the Schools: How Schools & Communities Must Collaborate to Solve the Problems Facing America's Youth*, 1991**

that programs are developmentally appropriate; structure programs so that they enable children to make a smooth transition into elementary school; and ensure that all early childhood education is well integrated.

- **At the state level.** Encourage cooperation among state agencies; promote state legislation to revise teacher certification requirements; facilitate training; promote innovation through recognition programs; provide technical assistance; and support model and demonstration programs.

- **At the federal level.** Promote federal legislation and funding for early childhood programs and urge Congress to develop legislation that would encompass the best ideas from existing federal programs.

AASA recommends that federal, state and local leaders work together to uncover new funding for children's programs; gain further support for early education and care programs through the media; and advocate for a district-to-national-level discussion of early childhood education.□

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

American Federation of Teachers

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) represents the professional, economic and social concerns of 780,000 teachers, classroom paraprofessionals, school-related personnel, public sector employees, higher education faculty and health care professionals organized into 2,000 local unions. Founded in 1916.

***News Releases* (1992).** In a series of releases, AFT declared a "state of emergency for children in crisis" and asked Congress to take legislative action immediately to correct the problem. Without such a response, AFT stated that the increased growth in childhood poverty will prove disastrous by the year 2000 for American education and America as a whole. It wants people to realize that situations that students must live with outside of the classroom significantly impact upon their ability to do well in school. According to AFT, the greatest problems facing students today are the increasing poverty rate among America's children, expected to reach 23 percent by the year 2000; the rise in the number of children being raised by a single adult; and an increase by the year 2000 of six million children who will need to be educated by our school systems.

AFT believes that when money is spent on education programs with well-defined objectives, the programs usually work. However, state and local governments do not have the resources to do this; hence, funding from the federal government is an absolute necessity if education reform is truly going to be effective.

In a 10-point plan, AFT proposes that a $10.5 billion peace dividend be used in the following areas:

- Increase Chapter 1 compensatory funding to serve an additional one million educationally disadvantaged children.
- Increase Chapter 1 funding to target full-day early childhood education for four- and five-year-olds.
- Increase funding for the Education for All Handicapped Children Act.
- Increase funding for Head Start so eligibility can be expanded and enrollment can be increased by at least 50%.
- Use Medicaid funds to employ guidance counselors and clinicians in elementary schools to help children with temporary problems and prevent inappropriate placement into special education programs.
- Increase the number of health clinics at or near schools to provide primary and preventive care for 15 million children.
- Allocate $500 million (first-year cost) for a five-year, $8 to $10 billion public works program to rebuild school buildings that are too small or dilapidated.
- Increase the number of special needs programs for homeless and immigrant children, as well as bilingual education and English-as-a-second-language programs.
- Increase the number of child care, prenatal care and preventive health care programs.
- Expand training programs for elementary and secondary school math and science teachers.

Because teachers cannot improve the state of education in America by themselves as long as children's basic needs are not being met, AFT calls for accountability and improvement in education to be everyone's concern—parents, school boards and, most importantly, the federal government. Education reform will be successful only when all of these people are involved and programs are fully funded. □

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Under the sponsorship of public education and with the formal cooperation of other relevant agencies and groups, order can be brought out of the chaos and fragmentation now characterizing early childhood policies, and the divorce between day-care programs and developmental programs can be reconciled."

***"The Case for Public School Sponsorship of Early Childhood Education Revisited,"* 1987**

"The Case for Public School Sponsorship of Early Childhood Education Revisited," in *Early Schooling: The National Debate,* New Haven: Yale University Press (1987). In this article, AFT President Albert Shanker makes the case for public school sponsorship of early care and education programs. Shanker recognizes the growing need for quality, accessible and affordable early care and education, and argues that the public school system is best equipped to provide these services.

After citing numerous studies supporting positive outcomes of quality care and education for young children, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, Shanker characterizes much of the early care and education available to parents as inadequate in quality, simply custodial and unable to provide children with the experiences necessary for sound cognitive, social and emotional development. Shanker argues that current public policies have had the following negative consequences for early care and education: an inadequate supply of high-quality public and private programs; access to child care programs across all auspices related to ability to pay; access to quality programs dependent on family income; and, within the category of quality programs, a dual system, one for the rich and one for the poor.

According to Shanker, public school sponsorship of early care and education programs would provide the opportunity to combine or coordinate child care and preschool education and make them universally available to all children. In considering the arguments against school-based child care, Shanker notes that critics of such a model fear that academic readiness will be forced on young children at the expense of their emotional development. To diffuse this argument, Shanker suggests that schools could provide both a day-long child development program and a half-day academic readiness program, giving parents the option to place their children in the development program all day, or to split the child's day between the two alternatives. Further, Shanker disputes the notion that school-based programs would be too rigid for young children, arguing that quality programs could be designed to meet the needs of individual children. Finally, Shanker addresses critics who believe that quality child care cannot be provided by the schools because the schools are failing to provide quality education. After emphasizing that some schools have made progress in response to education reform movements, Shanker proposes that the quality of child care can more easily be monitored in the schools than in private centers because schools must be accountable to communities.

Other advantages cited for basing early care and education programs in the public schools are that the public school system is: experienced in administering large and complex programs; universally available; best equipped to offer or coordinate the variety of services that support a child's development; and better positioned to address the staffing crisis in early care and education through its system of licensing and credential checking.

Shanker concludes that the early childhood community should recognize that with the public school system as the prime sponsor, quality early childhood education programs could be universally available to all parents who want them. In turn, the school system must recognize and utilize child development approaches to learning. □

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Association for Childhood Education International

The Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) is the professional organization for those involved in the education of children from infancy through early adolescence. Founded in 1892.

The Right to Quality Child Care (1988). In this position paper, ACEI affirms its position that "...the first duty of family and society is to protect, guide and give care to the young. Therefore, we declare that the child's right to quality care is fundamental." The U.S. has failed to recognize this right and, consequently, has instituted no national policy on child care. ACEI believes that all sectors of society—business, government, religious organizations, foundations, school systems, professionals and private citizens—must share in the solution to America's child care crisis.

ACEI calls for an educational emphasis in child care—an integrated system of care and education that supplements what families provide for children. It advocates an early childhood rather than an elementary school model for this system, one which has staff well trained in child development, an environment equipped with developmentally appropriate materials, and comprehensive services provided on-site or through referrals to other agencies. ACEI also advocates better salaries, working conditions and training for early childhood staff. □

"We need neither a custodial nor a narrowly educational approach to child care. *Developmental child care* suggests the protective and child-maintaining sense of *custodial*, plus the stimulating sense of *educational*....Developmental care further suggests a comprehensive approach that includes issues of health, family, nutrition and social well-being."

***The Right to Quality Child Care*, 1988**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) is an international organization of more than 160,000 education professionals who advocate improving the quality of education worldwide. Founded in 1943.

***A Resource Guide to Public School Early Childhood Programs* (1988).** ASCD developed this publication because it recognized the growing need for early childhood care and education for children from all socioeconomic backgrounds, as well as the solid body of research that suggests such programs greatly enhance a child's success later in life. This guide, which outlines the issues and concerns that surround decisions administrators and teachers must make regarding preschool programs, is intended to promote high-quality public school programs and to provide guidance to school leaders in establishing and revising their programs. It includes essays by early childhood experts on a variety of topics, descriptions of 19 public preschool programs, and a discussion of the critical issues prepared by ASCD's Policy Panel on Early Childhood Education.

The issues addressed by the Policy Panel focus specifically on public school programs for four- and five-year-old children. Despite criticism of public school early childhood programs, ASCD argues that schools do have the capacity to develop high-quality programs for the following reasons: 1) They have many of the resources needed to operate quality programs for young children; 2) Schools have a knowledge base about young children; 3) They have the physical facilities, administrative systems and professional staffing procedures needed to establish and operate programs; and 4) They have credibility in the community and well-established connections with parents, local government and other community agencies.

The Policy Panel makes recommendations on the following aspects of early childhood education programs:

- **Scope of the program.** Programs should cover the full day to accommodate working parents and reduce the stress sometimes experienced by children when moving from one facility to another. A full-day program also allows for an unhurried learning atmosphere. ASCD advocates for removing the distinction between care and education so that children can be provided with a safe and stimulating environment.

- **Who should attend.** Attendance at preschool programs should be voluntary. At-risk children are most in need of quality early childhood programs and should be served first; however, other children should be included in the program as soon as possible to avoid segregation and to give children the opportunity to learn from each other.

- **Evaluation of children.** Children should not be evaluated on the basis of test results alone; instead, test results, teacher observations, parent-provided information and data from other sources, such as medical records, should be combined to create a profile for determining how a child's needs can best be met. Comprehensive early identification should involve all school specialists and the parents. Caution should be used in interpreting the results of diagnosis, assessment or evaluation so that children are not labeled with unfair judgments.

- **Funding sources.** Federal, state and local governments are the major funding sources for programs, with business contributions and parent fees as potential sources. No one source can bear the costs of providing high-quality, comprehensive programs; therefore, collaboration must occur in planning, funding and resource utilization.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Part of any solution to the prevention of major social and personal problems in adults is to provide high-quality preschool child development programs to them when they are young."

***A Resource Guide to Public School Early Childhood Programs*, 1988**

- **Appropriateness of the program.** Research supports the effectiveness of academically and developmentally focused programs, indicating that they can produce significant gains in general school success. No one approach or program type is the most effective; rather, a variety of approaches must be used to meet the needs of students. Quality pre-kindergarten programs should, however, include the following components: 1) small-group, total-group and individual activities; 2) both teacher-directed and child-initiated activities; 3) time allotted each day for skills groups based on children's abilities; and 4) language-development opportunities, including speaking and listening comprehension.

- **Teaching reading.** The decision about when to begin formal reading instruction must be based on an analysis of the needs and abilities of each child and ongoing evaluation of whether these needs are being met.

- **Teacher qualifications.** Teacher qualification standards should be those recommended by the National Association for the Education of Young Children: 1) college-level preparation, including a foundation in child development theory and research; 2) training in developmentally appropriate instructional practices; and 3) supervised field experience.

- **Policy implications.** When instituting early childhood programs, elementary schools should be "adapted to create an optimal continuum of learning" for children. More specifically, the learning process should be viewed as a series of learning experiences that build on each other rather than a series of single experiences that somehow come together to make a whole.

Once early childhood programs are established, school officials must develop strategies for ongoing program assessment and begin a self-renewal process for all staff members. □

Business Roundtable

The Business Roundtable (BRT), an association of chief executive officers from more than 200 major companies, examines and develops public positions on issues affecting the economy. Founded in 1972.

The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education **(1991).** This publication focuses on the role of business in restructuring schools. The BRT identifies the following nine components as critical to successful education restructuring, arguing that, although priorities may vary from state to state, all nine must be included in any restructuring proposal:

- The new system is committed to four operating assumptions: 1) All students can learn at significantly higher levels. 2) We know how to teach all students successfully. 3) Curriculum content must reflect high expectations for all students, but instructional time and strategies may vary to assure success. 4) Every child must have an advocate.
- The new system is performance or outcome based.
- Assessment strategies must be as strong and rich as the outcomes.
- School success is rewarded and school failure is penalized.
- School-based staff have a major role in making instructional decisions.
- Major emphasis is placed on staff development.
- A high-quality pre-kindergarten program is established, at least for all disadvantaged students.
- Health and other social services are sufficient to reduce significant barriers to learning.
- Technology is used to raise student and teacher productivity and to expand learning.

The BRT calls on business to help shape the education restructuring process. Specifically, it encourages business leaders to work in collaboration with educators and state and community leaders to create a strategy for implementing the changes necessary to build a strong education system.

The BRT defines education restructuring as embracing all aspects of education, including personnel development, curriculum and instruction, decentralized school organization, accountability measurement, finance and budget, and capital and technological investments. It also includes meeting the human and health services needs of children before and during the school years and involving parents in the education of their children.

The BRT calls for a restructured education system that recognizes differences among children in how they learn, what motivates them, and the experiences they bring to the classroom; delegates authority to the school site and to the teachers and administrators who interact with students daily; places a premium on continued renewal and development of education professionals; measures learning by the student's ability to use knowledge; provides for accountability and meaningful incentives based on outcome, not on adherence to regulations; ensures that children enter classrooms ready to learn and that they receive appropriate preschool health, education and social support, and continued health and social services support as students; and integrates technology into the entire education system to improve the productivity of both teaching and administration.

According to the BRT, early childhood care and education must play a key role in education restructuring efforts. It calls for programs that address the physical, social, emotional and

"Early investment in children makes good business sense. Prevention is inexpensive compared to the costs to society of problems such as illiteracy, imprisonment, chronic unemployment, welfare dependency and substance abuse."

***The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education*, 1991**

cognitive needs of children. Recognizing that the risks associated with poor care in a child's early years transcend class, income and race, the BRT argues that comprehensive early childhood services should be offered first to those children most in need.

The BRT also calls on early childhood programs and the public schools to cooperate in ensuring that services are not disrupted when children begin school. More specifically, the BRT offers a vision of schools that make health and social services readily available, either by delivering them at the school site or in accessible nearby locations. Generally, the BRT advocates for changing the perspective of the service-delivery system from one that is service centered to one that is client centered, believing that such a change will help address all problems in a more coordinated manner and facilitate an individual's access to available services.

From this perspective, the schools are a natural place for ensuring that children's human services needs are met because schools are the only public institutions that touch almost every child. The BRT points out that if such services are integrated into the schools, they must either be provided with the resources and training needed to carry out the services themselves, or schools and other institutions must join together to provide the services. □

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

The Princeton-based Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT), a policy center devoted to strengthening American colleges and schools, conducts research and issues reports intended to shape public debate about education. Incorporated by an Act of Congress in 1906.

Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation **(1991).** This report, written by CFAT President Ernest Boyer, outlines a seven-step strategy to ensure that all children reach school well prepared to learn. It emphasizes that the loss of a supportive community environment (extended family, neighbors, community organizations and religious institutions) has increased the fragmentation of family life and made growing up more difficult for all young children, especially for those who suffer from poverty, neglect, sickness, handicapping conditions and lack of adult protection and nurturance.

Boyer believes that education reform is essential for the U.S. to remain civically vital and economically competitive. He argues that the first National Education Goal is the most important, because the other goals can be reached only if children are first given a solid foundation on which to build knowledge and skills. According to Boyer, school readiness encompasses the following: physical well-being, social confidence, emotional maturity, language richness, general knowledge and moral awareness. He points out that one of the critical elements of the first goal is its emphasis on children and the quality of their daily lives. As he states, "...what children need is not just 'more assessment' but more compassion and support, that what we must offer them is not just a 'restructured school' but assurance that they belong." To this end, Boyer suggests seven steps to prepare children for school and to prepare schools to support and nurture young children:

- **A healthy start.** Good health and good schooling are inextricably linked; therefore, every child must have a healthy birth, and be well nourished and well protected in the early years of life.
- **Empowered parents.** The home is the first classroom and parents are the first and most essential teachers; therefore, all children should live in a secure environment where empowered parents encourage language development.
- **Quality preschool.** Because so many young children are cared for outside the home, high-quality preschool programs are required that not only provide good care but also address all dimensions of school readiness.
- **A responsive workplace.** A key element in preparing children to learn is establishing workplace policies that are family friendly, offer child care services and give parents critically needed time to be with their young children.
- **Television as teacher.** Recognizing that, along with parents, television is the child's most influential teacher, school readiness

"America is losing sight of its children...millions of children in this country are physically and emotionally disadvantaged in ways that restrict their capacity to learn...a terrible price will be paid for such neglect, not just educationally, but in tragic human terms as well."

Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation**, 1991**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

requires television programming that is both educational and enriching.

- **Neighborhoods for learning.** Safe and friendly neighborhoods are essential to give children needed spaces and places for growth and exploration.

- **Connections across the generations.** These connections are critical to give children a sense of security and continuity, basic elements needed for school readiness.

To carry out these steps, Boyer proposes launching a "Ready-to-Learn Campaign" involving the federal and state governments and local communities. Specifically, he calls on the President and Congress to define the precise role the federal government will play in achieving the readiness goal. Boyer charges the Governors with taking the lead role in launching and coordinating the Ready-to-Learn Campaign. He suggests establishing a position in each Governor's office for a school-readiness coordinator who would help integrate all preschool efforts, coordinating the budgets of health, education and child services.

Local communities, Boyer advises, should organize Ready-to-Learn Councils to integrate the work of separate agencies, take inventory of existing programs on a regular basis, find out what new services might be needed, and establish a comprehensive Ready-to-Learn Campaign. Boyer identifies the United Way as an organization with the experience and credibility to take the lead in getting communities organized for action. To give overall direction and visibility to the Ready-to-Learn Campaign, Boyer suggests establishing a National Ready-to-Learn Center. This nongovernmental Center, guided by an advisory board of several of the major associations concerned with children, could serve as a clearinghouse for the states, monitor progress and report periodically to the nation. In addition, it could bring attention to the effort by celebrating success in Ready-to-Learn Campaigns across the country. □

Center for the Future of Children

The Center for the Future of Children (CFC), an arm of the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, is a multidisciplinary research, policy and granting program established to expand the Foundation's activities on behalf of children and their families. Founded in 1989.

***The Future of Children: School-Linked Services* (1992).** This special issue of the quarterly publication *The Future of Children* focuses on the school-linked comprehensive services approach through a series of articles by different authors on topics such as: the historical perspective on non-educational services provided by schools; key integrating elements needed for systemic reform; types of evaluations applicable to school-linked efforts; roles and responsibilities of collaborating agencies; an alternative community-based model of comprehensive services; and federal efforts fostering comprehensive, integrated approaches. An appendix describes current school-linked initiatives in 16 communities.

In an analytical section, CFC staff define a school-linked services effort as one where: services are provided to children and their families through a collaboration among school, health care providers and social services agencies; the schools are among the central participants in planning and governing the collaborative effort; and the services are provided at, or are coordinated by personnel located at, the school or a site near the school. The rationale for integration of education, health and social services is reducing systemic problems contributing to poor outcomes for children and families needing services.

CFC staff identify the following emerging criteria for effective school-linked services approaches:

- Participating agencies will have to change how they deliver services to children and families and how they work with each other.
- Planning and implementation should not be dominated by any one institution.
- Services should be comprehensive and tailored to the needs of individual children and their families.
- Each participating agency should redirect some of its current funding to support the new collaboration.
- School-linked service efforts should involve and support parents and the family as a whole.
- School-linked service efforts should be both willing and able to collect data about what is attempted and achieved and at what cost.
- Services should be able to respond to the diversity of children and families.

The report also discusses six critical issues that must be addressed as school-linked services are planned and implemented:

- Systemic changes must be made in both the schools and the child-serving agencies to achieve effective and sustained collaboration.
- Planners must answer the question of whether a school-linked effort is designed to serve all children or targeted to a particular population with specific, identified needs.
- Financing strategies require careful thought as they have a tremendous effect on whether service delivery is successful.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"No thoughtful person would dispute that one's productivity and prosperity as an adult are founded to a significant degree on one's education as a child. However, the schooling of many children is significantly compromised by health and social problems that require services beyond what their parents are able to provide....Because a number of these noneducational services are vital to enabling children to pursue their education, closer ties between schools and providers of these services are being considered or implemented in many areas of the country."

***The Future of Children: School Linked Services*, 1992**

- Research and analysis are necessary to develop measures to evaluate outcomes of school-linked services and to determine the optimum governance structure and the best way to organize services for successful implementation.

- State and federal leadership are critical to make the necessary changes in eligibility requirements, funding restrictions and program goals, as well as to provide funding for the large-scale evaluations needed to test the school-linked services approach.

- Experimentation with alternatives, like community-based approaches, should be encouraged so that planners will know what circumstances suggest what kind of integrated-services approach.

In conclusion, CFC staff express cautious optimism about the school-linked approach if true collaborations leading to fundamental change can be established among education, health and social service agencies and if current enthusiasm for school-linked services matures into a deeper commitment of public and private involvement and resources. □

Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning

The Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning (CFCSCL), a consortium of researchers at Boston University, Institute for Responsive Education, Johns Hopkins University, University of Illinois, Wheelock College and Yale University, conducts research, evaluations, policy analyses and dissemination to produce new and useful knowledge about how families, schools and communities influence student motivation, learning and development. Founded in 1990.

A Portrait of Schools Reaching Out: Report of a Survey of Practices and Policies of Family-Community-School Collaboration **(1991).** This report by Don Davies, Patricia Burch and Vivian Johnson details the results of a survey of 42 schools belonging to the League of Schools Reaching Out, a national network of schools organized by the Institute for Responsive Education in Boston. The survey sought to answer two questions: What are the strategies and practices of school-community-family collaboration in urban public schools that have a stated intent to "reach out" for such collaboration? How do formal and informal policies influence these strategies and practices? In asking these questions, CFCSCL sought to get a better picture of the combinations of activities and strategies schools are using to respond to the varied needs of children and families.

In general, CFCSCL found that, reflecting national and state interest in the non-academic needs of parents and children, reaching-out schools were redefining themselves as community institutions that provide information, training and support to families and community members. However, the majority of schools did not have sufficiently comprehensive programs addressing the extensive and diverse needs of all partners. Schools were providing limited help to families; for example, a school may have a hotline number parents can call for information and referral but no school- or home-based training for parents.

CFCSCL found that every school in the survey communicated with parents through a number of largely traditional methods like notices, open houses and parent-teacher conferences. Parents were more likely to participate in schools as volunteers and in their children's at-home learning as monitors rather than active initiators of activities. The most commonly cited barrier to greater school-family involvement was lack of time by parents, teachers or both. In the area of governance, CFCSCL found that 80 percent of schools had school improvement councils and parent associations, but many schools reported difficulty involving parents, beyond a small corps of activists, in planning and decision making. Although there was little firm data on the cost of family and community involvement activities, schools generally used district rather than federal funds for such programs.

In response to questions about the impact of policy on home-school-community partnerships, CFCSCL found that many schools had school- or district-level policies that affected their programs, usually either parent-involvement or parent-choice policies. A majority of respondents identified policies that hindered programs, such as limitations imposed by teacher and custodial contracts or inflexible district-level regulations. In general, the policy environment was obscure at the school level.

After profiling four schools in San Diego, Miami, Cleveland and Washington, D.C. that operate comprehensive programs, the report concludes that the family-school-community-partnership area is in an early stage of development and recommends much more work by practitioners, researchers and policymakers to develop a body of knowledge about practices, strategies and policies that foster partnerships.□

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Education for all children can be improved, but schools cannot be expected to accomplish educational improvement on their own...children — especially children living in poverty — will benefit if the key individuals and institutions in their work take seriously the idea that they have a shared and overlapping responsibility for the social and academic development and success of all children. Policies at all levels, both formal and informal, can help to make the idea of shared responsibility work better in practice."

***Mapping the Policy Landscape: What Federal and State Governments Are Doing to Promote Family-School-Community Partnerships,* 1992**

***Mapping the Policy Landscape: What Federal and State Governments Are Doing to Promote Family-School-Community Partnerships* (1992).** The authors of this report, Ameetha Palanki, Patricia Burch and Don Davies, examined six areas of policy development that they viewed as especially significant to family-school-community collaboration: interventions for infants and toddlers; family support; coordination of health and human services with education; parent choice; school restructuring; and Chapter 1.

CFCSCL believes that although collaboration among family, school and community should take place on the local level, all three levels of government must cooperate in their policies and practices or local collaboration will be seriously undermined. In evaluating the six policy areas to see if policies fostered partnerships or fragmented existing systems, CFCSCL uses the following criteria: flexibility, intensity, continuity, universality, participation, coordination and comprehensiveness.

In general, CFCSCL finds that 1990-91 developments in federal and state policies offer dramatic evidence of an upsurge of policymaker interest in various aspects of collaboration. Two examples are federal efforts to help local school districts ease transitions with Head Start programs and the state of Connecticut's appropriation of start-up funds for Family Resource Centers based on the School of the 21st Century model. The major deterrent to new partnerships is decreased government funds because of the current economic recession. In conclusion, CFCSCL calls for more research across programmatic and bureaucratic lines on the effects of policies that encourage collaboration on those served and on practitioners. □

***School and Family Partnerships* (1992).** This report by Joyce Epstein traces the development of theoretical perspectives about the influence of families and schools on children's learning and ties research to six types of involvement that help families and schools fulfill their shared responsibility for children's learning and development.

Epstein posits a model of overlapping spheres of influence between school and family with the child's development, learning and success as the reasons for partnerships between school and family. She states that a major conclusion of early and continuing research is that families are important for children's learning, development and school success across the grades. Students do better in terms of academic work, behavior and attitudes if they have parents who are aware, knowledgeable, encouraging and involved. Research reveals that effective practices of partnership are developmental; they must involve families in different ways across ages and grades. Also effective practices are responsive to common and different needs of families so that all families feel equally welcomed at school and involved in their children's education.

Epstein identifies five types of involvement that help school and families fulfill their shared

responsibility and a sixth type that brings in the community: 1) Families are basically responsible for building positive home conditions that support learning and healthy child development; 2) Schools are basically responsible for communication with families about school programs and children's progress; 3) Parents may be involved as school volunteers or supporters of school performances and sporting events; 4) Schools can request and guide parents to monitor and assist their children with learning activities at home; 5) Parents can serve in participatory roles in parent associations and advisory and decision-making bodies in the schools; 6) Schools can collaborate with other agencies, businesses and cultural organizations to share responsibility for children's education and future success.

For the research and evaluation agenda in the 1990s, Epstein recommends helping educators and families understand what their choices are for creating more productive partnerships; how to put specific practices in place; and what benefits or problems are likely to result from investments in partnership activities. □

Child Care Employee Project

The Child Care Employee Project (CCEP), a nonprofit resource and advocacy organization whose members include over 1,000 child care employees, policymakers and others concerned with child care, is committed to improving the quality of child care services through upgrading the compensation and training of child care providers. Founded in 1977.

Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America **(1989).** This report of the 1987-88 National Child Care Staffing Study explores how teachers and their working conditions affect the caliber of center-based child care available in the U.S. The study's major findings include:

- The education and work environment of child care teaching staff are essential determinants of the quality of services children receive.
- Among the adult work environment variables, the most important predictor of the quality of care children receive is staff wages.
- Staff turnover has nearly tripled in the last decade, jumping from 15 percent in 1977 to 41 percent in 1988.
- Despite their higher levels of formal education, child care workers earn abysmally low wages.
- Children attending lower-quality centers and centers with more staff turnover were less competent in language and social development.
- Compared with a decade ago, child care centers receive less government money, are more likely to be operated on a for-profit basis and care for more infants.

CCEP warns that without major improvements in the salaries and working conditions of child care workers, they will continue to leave the field, thereby endangering the quality of care that children receive. Parents are the starting point in advocating for better child care, with professional organizations, training institutions and service providers also playing key roles. CCEP makes the following five recommendations about how parents, corporations and the state and federal governments can work to solve the staffing crisis and improve the quality of center-based care:

- Raise child care teaching staff salaries to recruit and retain a qualified child care work force.
- Promote formal education and training opportunities for child care teachers to improve their ability to interact effectively with children and to create developmentally appropriate environments.
- Adopt state and federal standards for adult:child ratios, staff training, education and compensation to raise the minimum level of quality in child care centers.
- Develop industry standards for the adult work environment to minimize the disparities in quality among different types of child care programs.

"America depends on child care teachers. Our future depends on valuing them."

Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America**, 1989**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Publicize the importance of adequately trained and compensated teachers to gain public support for the full cost of care.

The report concludes that faced with a pool of consumers with limited ability or inclination to pay for the full cost of care and restricted government and corporate funds, the U.S. has implicitly adopted a child care policy that relies on unseen subsidies provided by child care teachers through their low wages. Such a policy forms a poor foundation on which to build a child care system to nurture and educate children. □

Children's Defense Fund

The Children's Defense Fund (CDF), a nonprofit research and advocacy organization, exists to provide a strong and effective voice for the children of America who cannot vote, lobby or speak for themselves. With a particular focus on poor, minority and disabled children, CDF's goal is to educate the nation about the needs of children and encourage preventive investment in children. Founded in 1973.

***Helping Children by Strengthening Families: A Look at Family Support Programs* (1992).** CDF published this report to provide child advocates and others who work for children's well-being with a clearer idea of what family support programs do, how they operate and why they are effective for all families, not only those with low incomes or serious problems. Advocating both the development of family support programs and the incorporation of family support principles into the delivery of all services to children and families, CDF includes numerous examples throughout the report of existing, effective program initiatives.

Drawing on previous research, CDF describes the basic principles of family support as: emphasize the family unit; build on family strengths; make participation voluntary; address family needs comprehensively; develop parenting skills; provide nurturing connections with others; respond to individual and community needs; work to prevent crises; respect individual and cultural differences; and coordinate and cooperate with other agencies.

After a review of major research studies of family support programs, CDF cites benefits such as improved long-term child development outcomes, better pregnancy outcomes, reduced incidence of child abuse and neglect, lower levels of family stress and increased parental self-esteem. CDF also analyzes effective, long-lasting family support programs and concludes they: respond to the community; remain flexible in addressing families' needs; build strong links with other service providers; engage in extensive outreach; provide effective staff training, supervision and support; secure a stable funding base; assess their program's effectiveness; and learn from the experience of similar program efforts.

The report also presents recommendations for action, including local establishment of family-centered, home-visiting programs, state support for comprehensive service-delivery systems that are responsive to family needs, and federal funding for a greatly expanded Head Start program and for family resource networks in every state. □

***The State of America's Children* (1991).** CDF published this report as part of its annual series depicting in both narrative and statistical terms the status of America's children in the following seven areas: family income and employment; child care; health; education; youth development; housing and homelessness; and vulnerable children and families. Examples are provided of legislative and programmatic initiatives addressing these problems. In addition to its current national legislative agenda, CDF presents its recommendations for action by all levels of government and the private sector.

In the child care section, CDF urges Congress to appropriate additional funds for the Child Care and Development Block Grant and the Family Support Act; amend the latter to ensure quality care; increase appropriations for Head Start to move toward full funding; and pass the Family and Medical Leave Act. CDF's recommendations for state action include:

- Carefully implement the new federal child care programs—the Child Care and Development Block Grant and At-Risk Child Care.
- Use federal funds to supplement rather than supplant state funds.

"Preparing all children to succeed in school is a worthy goal, and one that is essential to the future of our country. To meet this goal, however, the nation must do even more than make sure children have access to good quality preschool programs. We must also reach back beyond preschool to improve the care and education of our youngest children as well."

***The State of America's Children*, 1991**

- Supplement Head Start and other comprehensive programs so they can operate full day and full year.
- Establish strong health and safety standards for all providers.
- Invest necessary resources in monitoring and enforcement efforts.
- Adopt standards and policies that ensure quality care.
- Increase the supply of good quality care by setting up state loan and grant programs.
- Expand the supply of trained child care workers by establishing scholarships and loan-forgiveness programs.

CDF calls on local governments to:

- Appropriate local funds to supplement state and federal funds.
- Ensure that building codes and zoning practices do not set up unnecessary barriers for centers and family day care homes.
- Work with schools to develop school-age child care programs and teen-parent programs.
- Develop and implement strategies that help providers maximize use of federal funds, obtain liability insurance and benefit packages for staff, and strengthen business management practices.
- Educate the public, parents and providers about the need for and value of good quality child care.

CDF advocates that community and religious organizations consider sponsoring new child care programs; launch recruitment campaigns to increase the supply of family day care providers; recognize and publicize the role of child care staff in the healthy development of children; and initiate and support efforts to improve the quality of care.

Finally, for the private sector, CDF recommends that businesses: assist employees through adopting flexible personnel policies, establishing on-site or near-site centers, and supporting resource and referral programs; contribute to community loan funds; and help Head Start expand by donating funds, buildings and technical assistance. □

Child Welfare League of America

The Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) is an association of agencies and organizations, public and voluntary, that are devoted to improving life for at-risk youngsters. Founded in 1920.

***Building Early Childhood Systems: A Resource Handbook* (1991).** This handbook, written by Jule Sugarman after passage of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (CCDBG Act) and other child care bills in 1990, is designed to: present a vision of an early childhood system; describe new child care laws and what states must do to receive monies; advocate coordinated approaches by states and communities; and present examples of such collaborations. The appendices provide details about new and existing federally funded child care programs as well as tax credits available to families with children.

Sugarman argues that passing good legislation and funding programs adequately are first steps toward quality early childhood services. Leadership is the key to making programs work. Because legal and practical oversight of early childhood programs rests with state policymakers, Sugarman makes the following recommendations to them: ensure that every publicly funded early childhood program has a developmental focus; set program, staffing and training standards that assure adequate quality; finance programs at levels that assure quality and a family-responsive approach; give young children priority in public funding; figure out ways to help private programs improve quality; support and sustain inter-agency collaboration; and seek ways to ensure service continuity for children.

Although legal authority is concentrated at the state level, service delivery is performed at the local level. Sugarman recommends that state policymakers incorporate the following organizational and operational principles into their relationship with local entities: ensure that local early childhood decision-making bodies actively participate in policymaking; allow flexibility so that communities and service providers can tailor programs to the needs of individual children and families; make information and referral services for parents a priority; ensure that programs are parent responsive; and allocate adequate funds for training and staff development.

In his discussion of a systemic approach to an early childhood system, Sugarman highlights the following issues as one a state coordinator, charged by the CCDBG Act with designing a system, must address:

- establishing basic program-content standards appropriate to children with different needs;
- using one provider to provide back-up services to another in case of illness or other provider emergency;

"If children and their parents are to be well served, the time has come to develop comprehensive, coordinated, and efficient services for young children....Early childhood programs are now clearly part of the national agenda....What is missing is a sense of what system(s) would best accomplish our national objective."

***Building Early Childhood Systems: A Resource Handbook*, 1991**

- arranging complementary services so children experience seamless child care throughout their day;
- allowing children to remain in one program even if funding sources change;
- arranging program services that a single provider cannot provide efficiently, like child assessments;
- arranging funding linkages that are too complicated for providers to make on their own;
- establishing training and staff development programs that many providers can use and creating career opportunities for early childhood workers;
- planning for expansion and improvement of services;
- developing salary scales and benefit programs; and
- allocating adequate public funds.

In addition, the state coordinator should focus on subsystems that provide good opportunities for coordination among agencies and providers. For instance, providers may be able to agree on a joint resource-and-referral system or a joint training program, even if they cannot agree on a uniform salary system for staff. In the final section of the report, Sugarman provides ideas about how 12 different subsystems could work, including how they could be funded. □

Committee for Economic Development

The Committee for Economic Development (CED), comprised of over 250 business leaders and educators, is an independent research and education organization. As a facilitator for advancing business influence in education, CED works for the promotion of consistent growth in living standards and increased opportunities for all. Founded in 1942.

***Business Impact on Education and Child Development Reform* (1991).** This report, prepared by P. Michael Timpane and Laurie Miller McNeill for CED, explores the extent and impact of business involvement on education and child development over the last decade. In general, the authors conclude that the business community's input and influence are beneficial but caution that business can be only part of the solution to education's problems.

The report notes that the business community has had a long history of involvement in education reform. At the beginning of the century, the primary concerns of business leaders were universal schooling and vocational education. Business and education leaders agreed that effective educational training was needed to prepare students for productive work lives. This is still true today. However, in the 1960s and 1970s, with new issues in the educational arena such as desegregation, busing and school violence, business leaders began to see that their participation in education policy could have real costs. As a result, business lost interest and decreased its participation in education policymaking.

In the 1980s, business once again began to associate itself with public education and education reform for the following reasons: concern about changes in labor supply and demand that affected the quality and quantity of workers; the link between poor educational performance and lower productivity in the workplace; and the recognition that to meet the challenges of a more technologically advanced workplace, workers would require different and more complex skills.

Although management, accountability and education for work resurfaced as the dominant interests of business leaders, the latter no longer meant job-specific preparation. Rather, business leaders saw the need for general knowledge and skills that would enable workers to perform in a variety of situations and adapt to a rapidly changing workplace. And education for work also implied increased attention to at-risk children who would need more help outside the traditional school setting to attain necessary levels of skill and literacy.

Business wants schools to look more like itself—to move away from their traditional factory-like organization toward a model that provides clear expectations, incentives, resources, authority and responsibility for producing a greater educational outcome. In providing advice, encouragement and support to educators interested in reform, business can have four levels of involvement with schools:

- **Helping-hand relationship.** In this, the most widespread and popular type of relationship between business and schools, business enhances or supplements existing school programs by providing resources such as computers, employee volunteers and mini-grants. These relationships, highly successful at achieving peripheral goals, do not reform education; however, they are often a first step toward greater business involvement.

- **Programmatic initiatives.** At this level, businesses play a part in aiding the development or improvement of a particular school or program through mentoring and management programs and academies that combine schoolwork with career preparation. Business resources are used to change existing practice, rather than to enhance existing school

"...we can see both the possibilities and the limitations of the role of business in educational reform. Business can help define the problems and provide advice, encouragement, and support to educators and policy makers, but it cannot effect policy reform or improve schools. These must remain public responsibilities."

***Business Impact on Education and Child Development Reform*, 1991**

programs. Because of their careful design and the close and sustained relationship between business and the school, programmatic initiatives tend to result in substantial educational outcomes. However, this level requires a greater commitment from both business and the schools and a shared vision of the desired outcome of the relationship.

- **Compacts and collaborations.** A more advanced stage because it involves several businesses and one school district, these initiatives coordinate a variety of efforts serving a number of programs and schools and fostering district-wide policies for school improvement and reform. Compacts and collaborations often create new forums for debates about goals and performance and new expectations that district officials cannot ignore.

- **Policy change.** Recently, business leaders and organizations have been active participants in developing a wide range of new policies, especially at the state level. Over the past decade, state education policymaking has shifted from the province of state boards of education, chief state school officers and educators to a joint effort involving governors, legislators and business leaders. Business involvement began when governors and state legislators engaged corporate leaders in their new economic development and employment policy efforts.

According to the report, business community interest in promoting early intervention and prevention strategies for at-risk children involves only a handful of prominent spokesmen. Most business leaders have not yet become actively involved. The authors argue that this is not because of a lack of information about the benefits of early intervention and prevention strategies, but rather the problem seems to be one of business ambivalence about taking action and uncertainty about the role business can or should play in child development issues. The authors cite the following reasons for business reluctance to enter the early childhood arena: the perception of enormous additional costs, in contrast to the marginal additional expense of many other education reform efforts; the astounding confusion and complexity in the organization of early childhood and child care services, coupled with the absence of a single institution, such as the public schools, where such services can be provided; continuing uncertainty about the nature of business responsibilities, even for employees and their families; related reservations about the extent of public responsibility or intrusion in family matters; and the daunting prospect of hostile or indifferent legislators and policymakers.

The authors note that, with modest exceptions, there has been no widespread impact of business involvement on educational outcomes; however, renewed business interest in the education system has influenced education policy developments. Three distinct types of initiatives that model the business agenda have developed: improving educational quality by raising standards for students, teachers and schools and focusing on accountability; restructuring schools as places of work and teaching as a profession; and, most recently, focusing on the educational and social service needs of at-risk children.

The report asserts that business has made great progress in terms of basic awareness about issues

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

related to education as illustrated by the fact that human-resource development is often named the most significant issue for the future of most industries. It also states that corporate interest in education and child development is likely to continue because the demographic, technological and economic trends leading to the focus on human capital seem irreversible. To make its continued involvement effective, business should emphasize the following: stay the course as education reform is a long-term effort; promote national dialogue and federal involvement; pursue related human-service perspectives; build the infrastructure of business-education partnerships; support pertinent research and analysis; and review and assess business's own commitment and performance.

Lastly, the authors believe that business must hold itself accountable for education. This involves helping employees participate in educational activities; developing communication systems for regular feedback to schools; expanding cooperative education programs; supporting vocational development as well as management training programs in schools; and helping to create intermediary institutions like local education foundations. □

***The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education* (1991).** In this report, which outlines its views on comprehensive education reform, CED urges the nation to develop a comprehensive and coordinated human-investment strategy for child development and education so that all children have the opportunity to "develop to their fullest capacity for citizenship and productive work." To create a successful strategy, CED argues that not only must schools be restructured but also programs that serve the needs of children and families. Currently, such programs are uncoordinated and conflicting; they must be restructured to be comprehensive and coordinated.

To build more effective schools, CED asserts that society must do two essential things: redefine education as a process that begins at birth and encompasses the physical, emotional and cognitive development of children; and better equip schools to help children become educated no matter what their social, economic or cultural background. CED emphasizes that in developing programs for young children, the gap between education and care must be narrowed. The report states: "All programs for children from birth to age five—whether designated as child care, early childhood education, or preschool—should focus on their educational and developmental needs." Although there is likely to be wide variation in the specific elements (how they are organized, managed, staffed and the teaching methods used), restructured schools will provide more effective, efficient education and produce better outcomes for students and society.

CED has identified the following "ten key imperatives for change":

- The nation needs a comprehensive and coordinated human-investment strategy for child development and education that helps all children become productive citizens and self-sustaining adults.
- Programs for assisting children should also help strengthen the entire family.
- Every teen mother and father who has not finished high school should have access to a specialized school equipped to deal with the problems of teen parents and their children.
- Quality early childhood education should be available to all children who may not otherwise get adequate preparation for formal education from their families.
- Programs that address the needs of children and families must be flexible in design, administration and funding.
- Successful programs must be broadly replicated so that they are both more available and more accessible to all children in need and their families.

- The mission of the public schools must be redefined to account for the changing requirements of society and the needs of children. Clearer goals and more effective methods of measurement are needed if the schools are to become more accountable for results.

- Students must be encouraged to take greater personal responsibility for the success of their own education.

- Businesses should encourage their employees and other adults to volunteer in education and child development programs.

- Businesses should play a leadership role in identifying strategies for improving children's educational development and in determining what resources are needed to achieve results.

CED identifies roles for various levels of government and the private sector in education reform. Although education is primarily a state and local responsibility, federal government involvement is critical in setting education policy and providing funds for a variety of education and child development programs. It must also play a critical leadership role in setting the tone and pace of reform.

CED argues that the private voluntary sector has a vital role in developing and maintaining educational and other programs for children and families. It can also serve as an intermediary among business, education and government in linking the resources of a variety of public and private institutions.

CED directs business to focus its involvement in education reform at the state level. CED's past research has illustrated that business support of state and local education and child development efforts has often made the difference between success and failure. According to CED, business involvement in reform efforts can also bring credibility to the effort, thereby increasing support from the general public and policymakers.

CED also recommends that business pay special attention to the needs of children in the preschool years, rather than focusing solely on school-age children. □

***Children in Need* (1987).** In this report, CED calls upon the business community to act as the leading force in organizing a unified coalition of business, education, civic, parent and government groups to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. CED argues that if present trends continue, American business will confront a scarcity of well-educated and well-qualified people in the workforce. This impending employment crisis will seriously limit the nation's competitive position in the global economy. To improve the prospects of disadvantaged children, CED urges policymakers to adopt the following three-part strategy:

- **Prevention through early intervention.** Programs should be instituted that focus on children from birth to age five and on teenagers who are most at risk of premature parenthood.

"We call for a systematic reappraisal of the way our nation prepares children to become capable adults and urge the development of a comprehensive and coordinated human investment strategy for child development and education. Our nation must take on the difficult challenge of ensuring that all children have the opportunity to develop their fullest capacity for citizenship and productive work."

***The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education*, 1991**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- **Restructuring the foundations of education.** Many of the nation's schools, particularly those that serve large numbers of disadvantaged children, need a radical redefinition of their purpose and structure, including a fundamental restructuring of the way most schools are organized, staffed, managed and financed. Additionally, the relationship of school to society must be rethought. CED argues for a bottom-up strategy for the basic reform of all schools, focusing reform efforts at the points of learning—the school, the classroom and the interaction between teacher and student—and embodying the principles of school-based management and team decision making.

- **Retention and reentry.** Programs that combine comprehensive education, employment, health and social services should be targeted to students still in school and dropouts.

CED maintains that, at present, schools are not equipped to respond to the multi-dimensional needs of disadvantaged children nor can schools reach at-risk infants and toddlers and their families. Although a fundamental restructuring of the school system is essential to meeting the needs of disadvantaged children, it is imperative that solutions reach beyond the traditional boundaries of schooling to improve the total environment the child encounters. An early and sustained intervention in the lives of disadvantaged children, both in school and out, is society's only hope for breaking the cycle of disaffection and despair. Throughout its recommendations, CED emphasizes the importance of a comprehensive and sustained approach to the needs of disadvantaged children within the context of their families, their schools and their communities.

Business has an important role to play as a leading advocate of educational initiatives for disadvantaged children. CED recommends that advocacy include supporting local education funds, encouraging employee participation on local school boards and speaking out on behalf of public education at the local, state and national levels. Business should also take the lead in encouraging and supporting increased funding levels where they are needed both for early prevention programs and for the public education system. Business can also support education by providing opportunities for parents to participate in their children's schooling, involving employees in volunteer activities on behalf of the schools, helping teachers and administrators develop and hone new skills, developing mentoring relationships with individual students, and offering career counseling, tutorial services and opportunities for entry into the job market.

CED encourages the federal government to fund programs that have had demonstrable success, such as Head Start and Chapter 1, at levels sufficient to reach all eligible children. To ensure that programs operate effectively, the federal government should institute a system of continuous assessment and tracking of data. Additionally, the federal government can set the tone and direction for change by establishing and funding demonstration projects in early childhood education, dropout prevention and other programs targeted to improving the quality of education for children in need.

On the state level, CED concludes that state governments have taken the lead in education reform, resulting in some very positive effects on the quality of education. However, CED recommends that states resist the temptation to supplant local authority because state-directed programs tend to create layers of bureaucracy, produce onerous and ill-defined regulations and obscure the plight of individual students. Rather, local school districts and individual schools should be provided with enough discretionary power so that programs are kept small in scale, remain manageable and flexible, and can be individualized.

CED highlights the need for quality child care to ensure that young children have a safe environment in which they can expand their growing cognitive and social skills. Quality child care must also be made available so that parents can enter and remain in the workforce knowing their children are safe and well cared for. Child care

"There are no quick or easy answers to the problems of the educationally disadvantaged.... Effecting...longer-term reforms will take a sustained effort and a firm commitment over the years by a broad-based coalition of government, education, business, and community leaders. And it will require more money. *Any plan for major improvements in the development and education of disadvantaged children that does not recognize the need for additional resources over a sustained period is doomed to failure.*"

***Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged*, 1987**

must be of good quality if it is to have value. According to CED, quality child care programs have a high staff:child ratio, an appropriate developmental curriculum and staff with the expertise to address developmental problems. Child care programs should also have flexible hours to accommodate parents who work either part time or full time, should be located in neighborhoods where families live or near worksites and should be accessible by public transportation.

The report outlines a number of elements CED deems critical for schools to educate students effectively: schools should provide a safe and inviting environment; English-language proficiency should be a paramount objective of the school program; developing positive work habits, interpersonal relationships and character traits should be a primary goal of all classroom work and extracurricular activities; teachers should be given a more important role while being held more accountable for student progress; principals need to develop better leadership and management skills; schools should encourage greater parental involvement; extracurricular activities should become a more important part of school programs; and comprehensive health and social services are needed to address problems that interfere with learning.

In general, CED concludes that society must reconsider the role of the school in the lives of children and the community. Because public schools provide an ideal physical setting in which to offer a variety of services needed by large numbers of children, CED suggests making the school the focal point for community activities and social services targeted to children and their families, including parenting education, health care and social activities. However, CED emphasizes that the problems of children in need call for collaborations extending beyond the traditional limits of the schools. □

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conference Board

The Conference Board (TCB), an international business organization with over 2,500 members worldwide, seeks to improve the business-enterprise system and to enhance the contribution of business to society by sponsoring forums and research on key areas of changing management concern, opportunity and action. Founded in 1916.

***Corporate Support of National Education Goals* (1991).** In this report, author Ronald E. Berenbeim analyzes the results of TCB's survey of 176 companies regarding corporate concern about the quality of K-12 public education, the kinds of improvement programs that receive business support and the means used by individual companies to advance these programs.

Although the level of corporate financial support of efforts to improve public education is well documented, less is known about the reasons why business leaders have reached consensus on the need for reform and how these views are shaping the specific content of corporate initiatives. Survey results suggest there is widespread agreement among respondents on the following reasons for education reform: work force needs, global economic competitiveness and community quality of life. However, individual corporate views vary depending on industry, size and the underlying agenda that support is designed to achieve. Larger companies (more than 50,000 employees), manufacturers and investor organizations rated global competition as a high-level concern. On the other hand, smaller companies (less than 5,000 employees) that traditionally have strong local ties, such as utilities and financial service organizations, rated the need to maintain high standards in their community's quality of life as a more important factor in their support of education reform.

Participant support for education improvement is marked by initiatives with measurable objectives related to the company's interests and to which the organization can make concrete contributions. In principle, responding companies prefer active participation in school-improvement efforts through program assistance, including partnerships, advice and school-assistance programs. However, in practice, respondents are more closely divided between financial contributions (funds, facilities and materials) and program assistance as the primary methods of support. □

The degree of corporate interest in each of the six National Education Goals varies considerably. Respondents show a preference for support of Goal 4 — by the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement — and for objectives that seek measurable academic improvement. The report points out that these aims are closely related to the reason most often cited by respondents for supporting school-improvement initiatives: concern in meeting workforce needs.

The National Education Goals that address social problems, including the readiness goal (Goal 1), are the least likely to be advanced by corporate programs. The author notes, however, that early childhood or preschool programs are among the leading beneficiaries of corporate political support. This suggests some corporate interest in early childhood programs; but it also shows a

"Once seen solely as part of the company's contribution to local communities and U.S. society, education reform is being viewed as a necessary precondition to achievement of the company's business objectives."

***Corporate Support of National Education Goals*, 1991**

lack of confidence in a business-financed or -designed solution and a feeling that the political arena is the best place to address these issues.

The author concludes that U.S. business is undergoing a transition in its perception of education reform. Once considered part of the company's contribution to local communities and U.S. society, education reform is being viewed as a necessary precondition to achievement of the company's business objectives. The pattern of corporate support for education improvement will continue to reflect the divergent priorities of individual members of the business community. □

Council of Chief State School Officers

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), an organization of the 57 public officials who head departments of education in every state, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Dependent Schools and five extra-state jurisdictions, provides leadership on major education policy issues nationwide. Founded in 1927.

Families in School: State Strategies and Policies to Improve Family Involvement in Education **(1991).** CCSSO endorses the need for comprehensive family support, education and involvement efforts in the schools and recommends that these comprehensive efforts be long term, suitable to the needs of different families with different needs and developed in coordination with other community agencies if schools are to realize their full potential as community members. Believing that state education agencies can provide leadership and the catalyst needed to make successful family involvement an integral component of school and school district functions, CCSSO published this report highlighting the approaches used by Alabama, California, Florida and Minnesota to increase the involvement of families in schools.

Through its study of the four states and its contacts with other states, CCSSO found that states are employing a number of strategies to make family involvement systemic to public education. These activities originate in different ways, as part of programs to prevent child abuse and neglect as well as through school reform and restructuring efforts. Parent involvement is not the domain of any one unit of state education departments but is part of the activities of many staff members, including curriculum and program specialists working with children of all ages, from preschool through high school. Often state education departments offer technical assistance to school districts through materials development, information dissemination, conferences and training sessions. Acknowledging that it is too early to measure the effectiveness of parent-involvement initiatives, CCSSO reports that early experience indicates they foster better relations and communications between parents and schools. □

Early Childhood and Family Education: Analysis and Recommendations of the Council of Chief State School Officers **(1990).** In 1986, CCSSO began a two-year effort aimed at guaranteeing educational success for at-risk students. The second year of the venture placed special emphasis on activities relating to the education of young children and their families. This report on the project contains both a compilation of papers presented at a summer institute and CCSSO's policy statements and recommendations about early childhood and family education.

CCSSO envisions universal access to comprehensive early childhood education and family support services as the ultimate policy goal, with services for at-risk children and families as the first priority. The report highlights the consequences for children and society if bold policies providing quality early childhood experiences and comprehensive family support services for those in need are not developed and implemented. It also outlines the key elements of sound policy for states seeking to provide comprehensive early childhood and family support services.

CCSSO articulates five basic principles underlying its recommendations:

- All children must have equal access to high-quality early childhood programs.
- All families must have access to services that will help them both care for and educate their children and develop the skills and knowledge critical to family functioning.

"The dichotomy between nurturing and education has been blurred beyond distinction both because of the unprecedented societal changes affecting the very young and because of our knowledge that good care for young children promotes learning and good learning experiences are caring and nurturing. We know that families never cease being teachers; we also have learned that teachers must consider the total well-being of the children they teach."

***Early Childhood and Family Education: Analysis and Recommendations of the Council of Chief State School Officers*, 1990**

- Early childhood programs must be designed to help each child develop a full range of fundamental social, emotional, physical and cognitive abilities.

- Early childhood programs must be extended into and integrated with education at the elementary-school level.

- Resources and programs for children and families must be coordinated to assure availability, effectiveness and comprehensiveness.

Building on these principles, CCSSO identifies the following essential strategies for change that must be considered when developing and implementing early childhood and family support policies:

- Early childhood services need to be coordinated or "woven together," with children at risk given priority access because they are the least likely to participate and the most likely to receive measurable benefits in later school success.

- A successful family support policy must include programs targeted to reach new parents, home-based programs, continuity between formal schooling and early childhood programs, and cultural sensitivity that recognizes the desire and ability of families to help their children.

- Early childhood programs must meet quality standards for curriculum, staffing and assessment techniques.

- Schools should play a crucial role in collaborative efforts by working with other service providers to make these connections work. Collaboration should be required by statute and properly funded so that it can work. □

***Family Support, Education and Involvement: A Guide for State Action* (1989).** This guide for chief state school officers and their staffs identifies and promotes ways educational systems can assist families and work in concert with them and other service systems to help children maximize their success in school and in life. CCSSO presents research on the benefits of family support, education and involvement programs; discusses state strategies and actions that foster such programs; and identifies resources and organizations that provide leadership in these areas.

CCSSO believes that at a time when many families across all income levels are experiencing greater stress and when child poverty is at a record level, the school cannot view itself as an isolated institution within the community, separate from family and community services. Rather the school must be a responsible partner in efforts to develop comprehensive policies and services for children and families.

CCSSO recommends that state education agencies provide leadership in developing and expanding comprehensive family support, education and involvement efforts by:

- Helping to develop formal state policies and initiatives that are consistent across state

agencies and enhance the capacities of schools and communities to provide and support improved family services.

- Providing systems for identifying children's and families' needs and connecting them to necessary services.

- Incorporating family support, education and involvement requirements in state and local education initiatives affecting children and parents and putting mechanisms in place for family input into the planning, review and implementation of these initiatives.

- Collaborating with and encouraging local governments, agencies, community and social organizations, and business and industry to develop incentives to increase family and community involvement in schools.

- Recognizing and applying the structure and processes of community education to increase citizen involvement in community problem solving and decision making affecting schools and families.

- Providing state and local resources for developing comprehensive, well-planned family support, education and involvement programs in schools and communities.

- Increasing efforts to guarantee quality early childhood experiences, including comprehensive services for at-risk children and families. □

***Restructuring Schools: Potential for Students at Risk* (1989).**

In addition to papers presented at a 1989 summer institute, this report contains CCSSO's policy statement about school restructuring. Although CCSSO does not endorse a particular approach to restructuring, it identifies principles and strategies for restructuring. It believes the criteria of success for any restructuring option should be whether the restructuring improves student performance and allows students to reach their full potential.

After analyzing diverse restructuring models, CCSSO identifies the following essential principles to guide elementary and secondary education in making effective changes:

- **A vision of expected student performance.** Any effort must be guided by a vision of what students can and should accomplish. Establishing such goals and objectives is the most important responsibility for a state education department.

- **A belief that all students can meet high standards.** A restructured system must rest on the belief that all children can respond to excellent instruction and engage successfully in lifelong learning.

- **Essential role of families in learning.** Restructured schools must build on the role of families as teachers and must adapt to changed family responsibilities and patterns.

"Given the broad needs and the repercussions of inaction, it is a legitimate responsibility of the education system to provide greater assistance, coordination of services and support to families so that they have a stronger capacity to assist in the education of their children. It is also the responsibility of the education system to accept families as full partners in the education of their children and develop this relationship in the design and implementation of programs affecting children."

***Family Support, Education and Involvement: A Guide for State Action*, 1989**

- **Linkages among school and social services.** Restructured schools must make connections with other agencies to create more supportive environments for students.

- **Comprehensive changes within schools.** Sustained systemic change must be integrated and comprehensive.

- **Equity and excellence.** The state has a prime responsibility in assuring that the dual objectives of equity and excellence permeate all aspects of school restructuring.

- **Investment in professionals.** Time and financial resources for staff development are important investments for successful restructuring.

- **Education, employment and economic development.** The quality of the workforce is the combined responsibility of all sectors working together to achieve common goals.

- **Legal and financial support systems.** Successful restructuring requires support and continuity in legal, financial and organizational structures.

In addition to these principles, state strategies must strike a balance between state standards and the need for local flexibility to develop and operate programs and must include a careful asssessment of restructuring efforts. □

Council of Governors' Policy Advisors

The Council of Governors' Policy Advisors (CGPA), an organization of gubernatorial policy and planning staff affiliated with the National Governors' Association, advises states on a broad spectrum of policy matters. Founded in 1975.

Strengthening Families: A Guide for State Policymaking **(1991).** This guide, offering Governors and other public leaders a practical approach to designing comprehensive family policy, is based on the direct experience of 10 states that have developed comprehensive family initiatives through the CGPA Policy Academy on Families and Children At Risk. This Academy uses the following process: document and assess the problems confronting families and children; select goals and objectives for state family policy; develop and select strategies for family policy; and plan for implementation by building accountability systems and gaining support.

CGPA argues that a new way of addressing the needs of children and families is needed because the current system of social welfare policies and programs focuses almost exclusively on service delivery to individuals and not on improved outcomes for families as a whole. The result is an array of overlapping, loosely coordinated and costly initiatives that address individual needs but do little to strengthen entire families. CGPA maintains that families are placed at risk by a complex web of difficult life events, characteristics of family members and the perceived and real limits of support and opportunity. Individual and family problems are difficult to solve because the current social welfare system is not geared to recognizing or addressing clusters of interrelated problems, and the technology for dealing with multiple, inter-generational problems is still crude.

To change this ineffective, if not damaging, social welfare system, CGPA recommends that state leaders, particularly Governors because of their key role in changing social policy and public attitudes, develop a coordinated state-level family policy to address problems faced by families and children. Such a policy, involving both government and the private sector, would focus on achieving outcomes rather than merely delivering services; assisting families in providing security, sustenance and support for children; helping children adjust to society; and stimulating children intellectually.

Recognizing that any family policy requires a number of components, including education and child care, this publication also includes advice on integrating services and examples of how leaders approached family and child welfare issues in the 10 states profiled. □

"Family and children's policy is complex. Its implementation necessitates interagency, public, private, and multijurisdictional collaboration."

***Strengthening Families: A Guide for State Policymaking*, 1991**

Council of the Great City Schools

The Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS), a coalition of 45 of the largest urban public school districts, engages in research, legislation and other activities to promote the improvement of urban education. Founded in 1961.

Strategies for Success: A Plan for Achieving the National Urban Education Goals **(1991).** This report outlines CGCS's recommendations for reaching six education goals it adopted for the year 2000. Resulting from a series of meetings of CGCS members and 70 other organizations, these goals, similar to the National Education Goals, address the particular needs of urban areas.

According to the report, CGCS did not develop the national urban education goals to "further bemoan a long list of education's shortcomings" but rather to serve as a "rallying point and an impetus for concerted, creative action for improvement." The report emphasizes that educators know the litany of ailments as well as many of the answers to these problems. Believing that the consequences of inaction will be profoundly harmful to children, American competitiveness in a global economy and democracy itself, CGCS calls for sustained effort to transform the goals into accomplishments by the year 2000. With the exception of the readiness goal, only the goal itself is listed below; the report, however, also presents objectives, strategies and rationales for these strategies under each goal.

- **Improved academic achievement.** Schools and communities will demonstrate high expectations for all learners so that urban students will attain a level of achievement that will allow them to compete successfully with students nationally and internationally in our global community.
- **Readiness to learn.** All urban children will start school ready to learn. The objectives under this goal are: 1) Provide access for needy urban children age 3-5 to a full-day, full-year development program, offering a full range of health, nutrition, diagnostic, developmental, educational, social, language and other services; 2) Ensure that urban pre-K programs will be adequately staffed with qualified personnel and necessary equipment; 3) Make available comprehensive child care services to the children of students, and before- and after-school care for those in need; 4) Provide urban parents with the opportunity to receive training in parenting skills at school sites; and 5) Coordinate affordable preschool services throughout the community to ensure maximum benefits.
- **Increased graduation rates.** Urban schools will increase their graduation rates so they are at least comparable to the national average.
- **Post-secondary opportunities.** Urban school graduates will be fully prepared to enter and successfully complete higher education, experience successful employment, and exercise their responsibilities as citizens.
- **Quality multi-ethnic teachers.** Urban schools will be adequately staffed with qualified teachers who are culturally and racially sensitive and who reflect the racial characteristics of their students.
- **Safe and caring environment.** Urban schools will be free of drugs and alcohol, students will be well nourished and healthy, and schools will be well maintained and safe.

To help guide its long-term commitment to achieving these goals, CGCS established a national board of advisors from business, public advocacy groups, elementary and secondary education, higher education and CGCS member cities. CGCS is also developing indicators for measuring progress and assuring accountability.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Early intervention is particularly important to the millions of young, inner-city children who suffer from inferior health and nutrition, inadequate day care and insufficient parental involvement."

***Results 2000: Progress in Meeting Urban Education Goals*, 1990**

Finally, CGCS is drafting federal legislation that will provide funding for innovative education programs and capital improvements of school structures, and make funding available only to schools that demonstrate progress according to pre-set criteria. □

***Results 2000: Progress in Meeting Urban Education Goals* (1990).** This report assesses progress toward meeting the six urban education goals based on an analysis of standardized test scores and other statistical yardsticks, local evaluations of programs and practices, and other indicators of urban education achievement. Under each goal, the report specifies the indicators used to measure progress and provides case studies of urban school districts that have achieved success.

Under goal two, the readiness goal, the indicator of progress is that urban early childhood and preschool education programs are laying the foundations for learning. Case studies from Detroit, Jacksonville, Memphis, Philadelphia, Atlanta and Cincinnati are cited to illustrate progress based on achievement and diagnostic test scores. □

Education Commission of the States

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is a nonprofit, nationwide interstate compact with 49 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as members. Its primary purpose is to help governors, state legislators, state education officials and others develop policies to improve the quality of education at all levels. Founded in 1965.

***Exploring Policy Options to Restructure Education* (1991).** This handbook was designed to assist policymakers at all levels—federal, state and local—with their "unique and essential role of creating an environment that enables educators and citizens to make the changes that will result in an education system that provides a high quality education for *all* students." Prepared by a panel of local school board members and state legislators, the handbook calls for a total rethinking of the very structure of the education system so that it focuses on the individual education needs of all children and the communities in which they live; helps students apply what they learn in the course of education; and emphasizes the need for measurable improvement in student achievement in each school and district.

In general, ECS believes the primary responsibility of policymakers is to create a policy environment that supports people who want to redesign schools so that the focus is shifted to student-learning outcomes. More specifically, the policymaker's role includes:

- Establishing a vision of what students should know and be able to do, and how the education system should work.
- Reviewing existing policies to determine if they hinder or promote restructuring the education system for higher learning for all students.
- Debating options for policy change to support the vision.
- Making policy adjustments that stimulate desired change, deeper understandings and sharing of insight.
- Monitoring and evaluating the impact of policy adjustments on student learning and guarding against undesired consequences.

ECS specifies six categories of policy needing attention—leadership, learning, inclusion, organization, finance and review—and provides policy options and examples for state, district and school-level policymakers. ECS recommends that district policymakers consider, among others, the following new education structure: "A single administrative system, early childhood through higher education, is created for all public schools in the same geographic area," a system that "promotes dialogue, planning, commitment and continuity in developing students for lifelong learning."

In appendices, ECS describes some current restructuring philosophies and specific examples of how communities are restructuring their schools. □

"All Kids Can Learn," *State Education Leader*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 1991). Based on a synthesis of current research, ECS identifies four major factors that affect children's learning and motivation to learn and that are not being addressed coherently or comprehensively through policy or practice in most schools, districts or communities: parents' views of learning and their perceptions of their children as learners; mental and physical development; community attitudes toward school and learning; and classroom, school and district environments for learning.

ECS points to readiness as one of the most critical elements affecting children's learning,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"...the federal government should play a larger role in restructuring, particularly to assist children not yet of school age and adults who need to complete their education....If the federal government can take care of those two ends, the states can concentrate on what they know best—restructuring K-12 and higher education."

***Sharing Responsibility for Success*, 1990**

believing that children who are ready to learn come to school capable of trust, initiative, intimacy and hope, and with a sense of control and purpose in their lives. In addition, students who eat well, are clothed and feel safe are best able to deal with the frustrations and challenges of learning. ECS argues that effective policies can help ensure that each child arrives at school ready to learn. These policies should include: a process that provides immediate and accurate assessment of children's readiness for school; steps to diagnose and prescribe assistance for children determined to be "not ready" for school; ways for agencies to work together in providing the variety of assistance some children need, such as health or nutritional aid; an adult advocate for each child; and a record-transfer method that allows important information about a child to reach the school and other involved agencies. □

***The Education Agenda 1990* (1990).** This report outlines ECS's priorities for the 1990s. In the context of fundamental changes in the world and American society, ECS calls for the redesign or restructuring of systems in education and argues that reform leaders must define and illustrate exactly what restructuring means and how it can be accomplished.

Responding to its own charge, ECS outlines the following vision of American education that emphasizes what is desirable and possible and serves as a guide for efforts to promote positive and purposeful change:

- Express higher expectations and support higher achievement by all learners.
- Exhibit and encourage inclusiveness and a genuine appreciation for differences among people.
- Respond flexibly and resourcefully to change in the student population, economy, society and world.
- Develop individuals' capacities and skills to learn continuously and effectively, use their minds well and realize their full potential.
- Welcome heterogeneity in structures, schools, colleges and universities, curricula, teaching approaches and learning styles.
- Define and demonstrate accountability, both for student learning and for stewardship of public resources.
- Promote respect for others, service to the community and informed participation in the democracy.
- Affirm the shared responsibilities of all stakeholders in the educational enterprise—students, parents, faculty, administrators, board members, policymakers, education leaders, business and community organizations and the community at large.

The report also identifies three major focus areas for ECS's work in the 1990s: embracing diversity, transforming teaching and learning, and promoting system change. ECS's approach to these issues will be guided by the fundamental conviction that all children can learn. □

***Sharing Responsibility for Success* (1990).** This report calls for restructuring, rather than reform of, the education system. ECS prefers restructuring as a term because it "implies changing the fundamentals of education to focus more clearly on the learner and then putting them back together in a radically different way." The report identifies the following principles of restructuring: teach kids how to think; change what does not work throughout the system; re-educate the educators; let the people closest to the action make the decisions; invest in people; acknowledge that every citizen has a role to play and every child has a right—and should be ready—to learn; and recognize there is no one "silver bullet"—restructuring is complex and diverse.

The report also details the following strategies for restructuring and provides specific suggestions about what governors, district superintendents, business and industry, legislators, local school boards, state school boards and chief state school officers can do:

- Imagine a restructured system.
- Build a coalition committed to change.
- Encourage experimentation, risk-taking and flexibility.
- Use policies as catalysts to promote restructuring.
- Shift the education agency role from enforcement to assistance.
- Target pilot restructuring sites.
- Strengthen and change teacher preparation methods.
- Guarantee children are ready to learn.
- Finance restructuring like a business.
- Apply technology to create an active classroom.
- Monitor and hold the system accountable in new ways.
- Keep change alive. □

***Every Child A Learner: Reducing Risks of Learning Impairment During Pregnancy and Infancy* (1990).** This report, directed at state and federal policymakers in education, health and the environment, synthesizes findings of major research studies on the development of preventable learning impairments in children. It highlights the importance of defining strategies to meet the first National Education Goal. ECS argues that health-, environmental- and poverty-based hazards are limiting many children's ability to learn. By the time they reach school age, approximately 12 percent of children suffer preventable damage that inhibits them from learning as well as their natural endowment would allow.

ECS identifies the major preventable factors associated with learning impairment: low birthweight; prenatal alcohol exposure; maternal smoking; prenatal exposure to drugs; lead poisoning; child abuse and neglect; and malnutrition. The effect of each of these risk factors is difficult to measure because they are often intertwined, resulting in a cumulative impact on learning abilities. Learning problems are also compounded for many children by social factors such as poverty, social disadvantage and parental disinterest. Risk factors also have different effects depending on the intensity of the exposure, the point in the child's development when it occurred and the resiliency of the child.

ECS argues that many of the risk factors outlined above are preventable through enlightened policymaking and programs attentive to the particular vulnerability of children and advises starting with strategiesto: eliminate the risk factors; intensify work with children already affected; and restructure schools to create active rather than passive learning for all children.

As one of its prevention strategies, ECS suggests the following: enriched intensive programs for infants and parents affected by drugs, alcohol and abuse; flexible, family-centered early childhood programs widely available in all communities; extension and strengthening of successful nutritional entitlement programs; and comprehensive attention to the primary prevention of lead poisoning and the identification of all children with lead exposure.

In conclusion, ECS states that for every suggested cause of learning impairment, there are successful prevention programs. However, their effect is limited because there is no coordinated effort nationally or in individual states to deal with these problems. ECS directs policymakers to develop policy options that build on these programs and give adequate attention to eliminating or lessening the effect of each risk factor. ECS warns that a failure to do so will place an enormous burden on the schools and on the lives of many children and their families.

Family Diversity and School Policy **(1987).** In this paper, ECS policy consultant Barbara Lindner discusses the roots of the mismatch between the diversity of American families and inflexible school structures, and presents some possible solutions for making schools and the workplace more family friendly. The paper outlines the current controversy over the state of the American family and presents data that place contemporary families on a continuum of change in family structure throughout the 20th century.

Lindner argues that if schools are to educate all children effectively, policymakers and educators must understand how school policies have been influenced by misconceptions about the family and devise new ways to work with children and families. She identifies three myths that have shaped family and school policy: 1) the Myth of the Monolithic Family Form, or the idea that the American family includes a working father and a full-time mother at home; 2) the Myth of Family Independence; and 3) the Myth of Parental Determinism, both of which perpetuate the notion that parents are solely responsible for the success or failure of their children, and that government policy should not be concerned with the quality of family life. According to Lindner, these myths are used to justify inaccessible and/or inadequate services for children.

Because family independence and parental determinism are myths, policymakers and educators must acknowledge that today's families need help raising their children. Lindner recognizes that families have a wide variety of different needs, and, therefore, policies addressing their needs will vary among states, communities and schools. Emphasizing that schools and teachers cannot be expected to provide every service children and families need, she argues that schools have a key role in directing families to the appropriate agencies and helping with the coordination of services.

Lindner makes some basic suggestions about how school and business leaders can support families. Teachers and administrators should consider spending time in the neighborhoods and homes of the students they teach, including holding meetings and events in those neighborhoods. The business community should take more responsibility for the well-being of children and families by facilitating the integration of work and family through: child care information and coordination services; on-site child

"Schools...cannot be expected to play every role and provide every [family support] service....However...schools could be the connecting point, directing families to the appropriate agency and helping with the coordination of services."

Family Diversity and School Policy**, 1987**

care; flexible hours; personal leave days; sick leave for families; and the option to work at home.

Lindner concludes that if schools do not change their policies to address the diversity of American families, schools will construct additional barriers to the education of children and the family's ability to take part in that education. □

Families and Work Institute

The Families and Work Institute (FWI) is a nonprofit research and planning organization that conducts research on business, government and community efforts to help employees balance their job and family responsibilities. Founded in 1989.

The Private Sector as a Partner in Early Care and Education **(1990).** This research paper, written by FWI Co-President Ellen Galinsky, traces the development of corporate involvement in child care and early education from the 1960s to the present, discusses the kinds of roles business plays in these areas and identifies issues of concern for the future.

Up to the early 1980s, business leaders were reluctant to become involved with child care because of the prevailing view that work and family were separate issues; child care was a women's issue; and the only option for corporations was on-site child care. A few trailblazers did believe it was appropriate to help employees with child care problems and set up programs such as resource and referral, flexible spending accounts permitted under the tax code and parent seminars at work. Galinsky reports that generally when a company had taken one or more of these actions, it felt that child care problems were resolved and it could move on to other issues.

Beginning in the late 1980s, increased business interest in early childhood education emerged because of concern about the viability of the future workforce. Business involvement in child care became more mainstream. Galinsky identifies some other trends in business interest: a focus on child care has expanded to encompass elder care and the development of personnel policies that help employees balance work/family responsibilities; an executive-level commitment to work/family policies has developed; a commitment to work/family issues is considered a business issue; an emphasis on time flexibility is emerging; and company culture is recognized as key to work/family solutions.

Galinsky describes five roles business plays in the early childhood field: analyzer of the local early childhood market; actual provider of on-site or near-site care (about 1,000 employers now do so); contributor to enhancing and expanding the existing child care system within the community; legitimizer of the issue and profession of child care through testimony before, for example, Congressional committees; and change agent through participation on state and local early childhood care and education task forces.

Future issues of concern that Galinsky identifies include questions about the extent of business involvement, especially in an economic downturn; the quality of business initiatives as they become more widespread; equity of business policies for higher- and lower-ranked employees; continued assumption of business leaders that education and care are different; and the role of business in supporting standards of quality care. □

"...the exemplary companies have moved away from a fragmented approach to a more holistic view, from an emphasis on child care to the broader scope of work/family for employees at whatever stage their families are in. The notion of corporate involvement in family issues has become more ingrained, integrated and mainstream."

The Private Sector as a Partner in Early Care and Education, **1990**

Family Resource Coalition

The Family Resource Coalition (FRC), representing more than 2,500 family resource programs throughout the U.S. and Canada, seeks to build support and resources within communities that strengthen and empower families, enhance the capacities of parents and foster the optimal development of children and youth. Founded in 1981.

Programs to Strengthen Families: A Resource Guide **(3rd ed., 1992).** As with the previous editions, FRC published this guide as a snapshot of the diversity of family resource programs in the U.S. and Canada. Chapters contain descriptions of programs that: provide collaborative and comprehensive services; began as partnerships between schools and families; were designed to support and strengthen families and are either freestanding or located in other settings; have incorporated a family support component into an organization with a different primary function or mission; and are initiatives of state government to provide preventive services to families.

Although the programs profiled are different, they share a commitment to strengthening the capacity of families to nurture their children and to FRC's principles:

- The basic relationship between program and family is one of equality and respect; the program's first priority is to establish and maintain this relationship as the vehicle through which growth and change can occur.
- Participants are a vital resource; programs facilitate parents' ability to serve as resources to each other, to participate in program decisions and governance, and to advocate for themselves in the community.
- Programs are community based and culturally and socially relevant to the families they serve; programs are often a bridge between families and other services outside the scope of the program.
- Parent education, information about human development and skill building for parents are essential elements of every program.
- Programs are voluntary, and seeking support and information is viewed as a sign of family strength, not indicative of deficits and problems. □

Helping Families Grow Strong: New Directions in Public Policy **(1990).** This report contains papers from a colloquium on public policy and family support held in 1989 to look at the current status of the family support field, consider implications of family support activity for public policy and explore future developments of the field.

In the report's overview, FRC identifies the following set of premises that form the basis of family support programs:

- All families need help at some time in their lives, but not all families need the same kind or intensity of support.
- A child's development is dependent upon the strength of the parent/child relationship, as well as the stability of the relationship among the adults who care for and are responsible for the child.
- Most parents want to and are able to help their children grow into healthy, capable adults.
- Parents do not have fixed capacities and needs; like their children, they are developing and changing and need support through difficult, transitional phases of life.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"At the heart of family support and education initiatives is the goal of empowering families to better cope with the stresses of contemporary life."

***Helping Families Grow Strong: New Directions in Public Policy*, 1990**

- Parents are likely to become better parents if they feel competent in other important areas of their lives, such as in their jobs and in their family and social relationships.

- Families are influenced by the cultural and societal pressures in their communities.

FRC believes that these assumptions about the circumstances of families point to the following principles about how services for families can provide the greatest, most effective level of support. Programs should:

- Sustain and enrich the capacity of families to maintain a nurturing environment for their children. Rather than focus on deficits of the family, services should emphasize the existing strengths of families and help them supplement their own resources.

- Be available to families at the earliest stage of development and at subsequent stages as needed to strengthen coping capacities.

- Rely on voluntary participation. Services should be developed and provided within the context of a close, cooperative working partnership among families, their community and program staff. Services should reflect the interests and cultural values of families and link with other community resources that families already use.

- Provide parents with the skills and knowledge they need to advocate for themselves and their children.

- Be multi-disciplinary in approach and staffing to reflect a comprehensive approach to families' needs and situations.

FRC believes states can set up family support programs and integrate the family support approach into all service-delivery systems. The potential benefits are that families will move toward self-sufficiency; children will be better prepared for school and school success; young families will be strengthened; child abuse and neglect will be prevented; and the healthy birth and development of mothers and their infants will be promoted. □

Institute for Educational Leadership

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the quality of educational policymaking by linking people and ideas to address difficult issues. Founded in 1971.

The Same Client: The Demographics of Education and Service Delivery Systems **(1989).** Written by Harold Hodgkinson, Director of IEL's Center for Demographic Policy, this publication discusses IEL's views on interagency collaboration. Hodgkinson maintains that collaborations among organizations providing education, transportation, health, housing and corrections services are necessary to provide effective assistance to children and families. To establish collaboration, Hodgkinson recommends that service organizations recognize that they assist the same clients and become familiar with each other's efforts. □

Education and Human Services Consortium Reports. IEL is a partner in this coalition of 24 national organizations whose shared goal is more responsive delivery of education and human services to children and families. The Consortium has released a series on collaboration available from IEL. The reports are intended to bring resources making a significant contribution to the study and practice of collaboration to a wider audience in the hopes of fostering dialogue and constructive action. The series includes the following titles:

Serving Children and Families Effectively: How the Past Can Help Chart the Future (1991). Authors Peter B. Edelman and Beryl A. Radin present a new perspective on the delivery of services in the 1990s using an examination of a number of service and access models of the late 1960s and '70s.

Thinking Collaboratively: Ten Questions and Answers to Help Policy Makers Improve Children's Services (1991). Written by Charles Bruner, this report is intended to help state and local policymakers consider how best to foster local collaboration, and uses an innovative question-and-answer format and checklists to help the reader quickly assess the key issues.

What It Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families with Comprehensive Services (1991). In this report, Atelia I. Melaville and Martin J. Blank describe what high-quality, comprehensive services should entail and explore the potential of interagency partnerships as the key to providing the large-scale delivery of such services.

New Partnerships: Education's Stake in the Family Support Act of 1988 (1989). This report examines the possibilities for collaboration among education and welfare agencies in the implementation of the Family Support Act of 1988. □

"...educators at all levels need to begin to become familiar with other service providers at their level, as *they are serving the same children and families as clients.* It is painfully clear that a hungry, sick or homeless child is by definition a poor learner, yet schools usually have no linkage to health or housing organizations....At a time when service organizations are increasingly strapped financially...we could still magnify the effectiveness of each dollar several times through programs based on interagency collaboration at each governmental level."

***The Same Client: The Demographics of Education and Service Delivery Systems*, 1989**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Alliance for Business: Center for Excellence in Education

The Center for Excellence in Education (CEE) seeks to help the business community establish partnerships with educators and elected officials to develop consensus for creating a renewed and more effective education system and to assist with specific education improvement initiatives. Founded by the National Alliance for Business in 1990.

News Release **(1990).** In a statement released at the time of its establishment, CEE identifies a number of critical areas for action, the most important of which is the formation of broad-based coalitions of educators, government officials, state and community leaders and business people to work together to "understand education issues, identify critical problems, establish goals, and develop a plan of action." Other areas for action include: upgrading the preparation and skills of education professionals; improving the content and delivery of curricula; changing management and governance; developing quality accountability systems; developing effective and efficient systems for financing and budgeting education; upgrading the quality of the education infrastructure; and addressing the social and health needs of students in a comprehensive and coordinated manner.

CEE has identified its four major objectives in promoting business involvement in education restructuring:

- Help business to identify how it can best use its unique expertise to foster educational change, including defining specific roles for business in stimulating local and state restructuring initiatives.
- Work with business to build long-term coalitions among education, business, community groups, and state and local leaders to achieve school reform, including educating the business community about current education issues, offering direct assistance in building coalitions, and providing training in coalition-building techniques.
- Aid corporations in developing plans for long-term involvement in education, including the establishment of relevant corporate policies and a more focused use of resources.
- Develop policies to promote education reform at the national, state and local level, including participating in policy discussions and synthesizing policy options for companies working at the state and local level. □

"A fundamental restructuring of American education is needed...No longer can we afford an education system that 'throws away' the 25 percent of our children who drop out of school each year, or write off an additional 50 percent who are unable to function fully as citizens or workers....We must now build a national consensus behind the achievement of our national education goals by the year 2000. Business can and must play an important collaborative part in educational restructuring, but in order to do so, it must be informed so it can act in new and different ways."

News Release**, 1990**

National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies

The National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (NACCRRA), an organization of resource and referral (R&R) agencies, promotes the development, maintenance and expansion of quality child care R&R services. Founded in 1987.

A Hitchhiker's Guide to the Child Care Universe: A Tour for New Policy-Makers **(1992).** In this policy paper, Gwen Morgan describes the child care universe in the United States so that an "interplanetary visitor" could understand the importance of child care, its many forms and its multiple funding sources, and offers a vision of a better, future system.

Morgan argues that child care is a necessity in the U. S. economy. It increases tax dollars both by allowing parents to work and by increasing a child's later success in school and in the workforce. She cites data from studies that an investment in good quality child care has a seven-to-one payoff.

The cost of quality child care represents what Morgan calls a trilemma. Center directors must juggle three factors—staff:child ratios, wages and price. Setting any two of the three factors at a desirable level destroys the third factor. Morgan believes this trilemma inhibits the supply of child care. The child care market has always been subsidized by the low wages of both center staff and family day care providers. Now staff are behaving less "altruistically" and leaving the field for better-paying jobs. Quality of care has suffered because of this high turnover.

Morgan states that the most important step in improving the quality of child care is the development of a comprehensive, statewide early care and education professional development plan to train center staff and family day care providers. Other workforce strategies include: loan forgiveness for students; scholarship funds for teacher preparation; health benefits; pay scales that reward longevity and increased professional training; and mentoring programs for newcomers to the field.

In her discussion of the cost of child care, Morgan addresses the question of who pays what share. Now parents contribute almost twice what the federal and state governments do to the total cost of care. She suggests that higher education financing could be a model—state and federal government pay for half the cost and students pay for a third—although she recommends that parents pay less than a third.

Using both narrative and charts, Morgan describes federal policies and funding sources for child care. She also outlines the different levels of regulation states can opt for: basic consumer protection (licensing, health and safety approvals and registration); fiscal regulation; and accreditation for quality programs.

Finally, she advocates for a vision of child care—collaboration across government agencies and with the private sector on a system that is financed by diverse sources and provides choices for parents. □

Child Care Crossroads **(1991).** In this policy paper, Ellen Galinsky outlines the progress made in the child care field during the 1980s and the obstacles that still confront the profession. She cites business's and the federal government's growing recognition of the need for quality, affordable child care as major advancements.

Although these developments have brought the child care crisis to the public's attention, she identifies the following hurdles to overcome in creating a system of quality, affordable care: a lack of affordable quality child care choices for parents; additional burdens put on the child care system by recent welfare reform legislation; the

"I see the 1990s as the decade of collaboration. We're going to have to learn to work together among many different groups because no one group is going to solve these problems alone. If it's child care vs. the schools, we all lose."

***Child Care Crossroads*, 1991**

staffing crisis created by low wages and the lack of a career ladder; the movement of four-year-olds into the public schools; the increased emphasis on testing, tracking and screening; the segregation of at-risk children in compensatory programs, resulting in de facto racial segregation; dwindling resources for comprehensive family services; cut backs in other services, including training and R&R; the creation of a two-tiered system of licensed and unregulated care; the questioning of parental choice in selecting child care; an increase in territoriality; and the myth that R&R can do it all.

Galinsky describes a number of assumptions that make the above obstacles even more difficult to resolve, including: many people still believe that mothers should not work outside the home; early childhood education is increasingly viewed as a panacea for the problems of at-risk children and families; children are seen as problems, not people; and child care and education are considered two separate functions.

Underscoring the dangers of isolating child care from education, Galinsky argues that this critical misconception underlies many of the obstacles described above and surfaces in much of the political rhetoric about child care and early education. For example, the National Education Goals assume that preparation for school can only take place in Head Start and pre-K programs, not in child care. Additionally, Galinsky points out that there are not enough quality child care choices because people do not understand that children are learning in good quality child care programs, whether they are called school or child care. The separation of child care and education also contributes to the staffing crisis because people assume that providing child care does not take any special skill and, therefore, should not be highly rewarded. Galinsky attributes the current conflict over who "owns" the system to the lack of understanding that early childhood education takes place in a variety of settings and that child care and early education are inseparable. Galinsky concludes that the impact of the separation between care and education is destructive because it creates discontinuity in the programs and services children receive. She urges all people who care for children to work collaboratively.

Galinsky argues that R&R has a very important role to play in breaking down barriers between care and education and helping to build collaboration in communities. She calls on R&R agencies to take a leadership role in bringing together the key players in the early childhood field to work toward what is good for children, their families and their teachers. □

***Two Visions: The Future of Day Care and Early Childhood Programs* (1987).** This policy paper by Gwen Morgan presents two alternative models or visions for a system of child care and early education. Morgan argues that any workable model must combine the policy objectives of support for working parents, who are critical to national productivity and economic development, with the education of young children, who are the citizens and workers of tomorrow.

Morgan argues that the present system is too fragmented, inaccessible, unaffordable and unregulated to be feasible as a vision for the future of care and education. A universal free program paid for with federal tax dollars is also not a realistic plan. Thus, there are only two

viable alternatives: a system centralized through the public schools and a parent-choice system that includes the schools but is based in the community.

The paper offers a detailed outline of the implementation and operation of the two visions. The description of a school-based system is drawn from Dr. Edward Zigler's School of the 21st Century model. Its central focus is the local school building, which would house two major, but separate, systems: the formal education system, as it is presently structured, run by professionals with expertise in public education, and a child care system run by professionals with expertise in child development.

Morgan favors the parent-choice model. Although she recognizes the appeal of a school-based model, she argues that a system based on parent choice is less expensive, easier to implement, preserves what quality exists in the current system and would strengthen families by emphasizing informed parent choice. The parent-choice model builds on the existing variety in programs and auspices, recognizing what excellence has been achieved so far in early childhood programs and seeking to: improve quality where needed; link services; match supply and demand; increase the number of funding streams; assure accessibility and affordability to parents; and preserve the values of parent choice and a degree of program autonomy.

The central focus of this model is the community-based Resource Center that provides support services to parents, providers and the community but does not bureaucratize the control or centralize the management of early care and education programs. Resource Centers, funded by a mix of public and private dollars, are designed based on the following: parental leave for the first three to fourth months of a child's life; stronger links between the public school system and early care and education providers; developmentally appropriate care and education programs for children of all ages provided through the public school system and funded by state Departments of Education; care and education provided by the current range of early care and education programs that meet quality standards; mainstreaming of young children with special needs; and programs offering parent services. Every program component would emphasize both care and child development at all times of the day.

Resource Centers would provide a wide variety of services, including: centralized referral services and consumer information; family support services; recruitment of family day care providers; training and technical assistance for providers; and the collection and compilation of supply and demand data. The Center would be governed by a representative community board.

A number of different staffing levels would be used in the parent-choice system. Salary scales and a career ladder would reward increased education and longevity on the job. The career ladder would extend across centers, family day care providers and the public schools. Morgan argues this differentiated staffing pattern would help maintain low child:staff ratios and high quality.

The state would regulate private care and education programs. The federal role in licensing would be expanded to include funding and technical assistance to states in improving their licensing systems. The current state-level process of standards development would be strengthened and federally mandated. Programs would be required to meet licensing requirements to receive public funds, whether by voucher or contract. Programs in the public schools would be regulated by the state education department.

The parent-choice system would be funded through parent fees, with a wide variety of public and private sources closing the gap between fees and the cost of a quality program. Although reliable cost estimates are not available, Morgan judges the cost to be $32 billion for care and education programs for the children of all working mothers.

Morgan acknowledges that, regardless of which vision prevails, the involvement of the public

schools in child development programs will continue. She suggests that education policy-makers consider how the education system can be creatively organized for the effective delivery of quality programs; for example, new divisions or boards could be established to oversee early childhood programs. Morgan emphasizes the critical importance of improving collaboration between schools and private early care and education programs in the community so that children experience continuity as they move between community programs and schools.

Because Morgan views early care and education programs essentially as local services, local government has an important role to play. It needs to consider how best to organize early care and education functions within its overall structure, and how to identify the diverse funding streams and systems within its jurisdiction.

Morgan argues that public policy should support all family functions. Specifically, programs promoting economic self-sufficiency for parents must be accompanied by available, quality child care options. To increase public policy support, advocates must present a single vision, including: universalized quality care for the children of working parents; educational programs for low-income children; self-sufficiency programs for welfare families; and programs that strengthen families in need of protective services. Morgan suggests this single vision could be fashioned by connecting the quality programs and services that exist and adding additional programs where necessary. She argues that this, as opposed to developing a whole new system, is more likely to inspire consensus about a practical, feasible vision that can be put into place immediately.□

"Decisions on child care issues need a context for what the system is supposed to look like...The future of the child care system will require collaboration across different agencies of government and public-private collaboration. The model for funding will be diverse...with a variety of public and private funds flowing both to programs and to consumers."

***A Hitchhiker's Guide to the Child Care Universe: A Tour for New Policy-Makers*, 1992**

National Association for the Education of Young Children

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), representing more than 79,000 members, is an organization of early childhood professionals and others dedicated to improving the quality of services for young children and their families. Founded in 1926.

***NAEYC Position Statement on School Readiness* (1990).** Concerned that the construct of school readiness is based on the assumption that there is a predetermined set of capabilities that all children need before entering school, NAEYC believes that those committed to universal school readiness must also be committed to: addressing the inequities in early life experience so that all children have access to the opportunities that promote school success; recognizing and supporting individual differences among children; and establishing reasonable and appropriate expectations of children's capabilities upon school entry.

Although schools may reasonably expect that children entering kindergarten will be active, curious and eager to learn, NAEYC warns that it is extremely difficult to develop reliable and valid measures of young children's abilities. The nature of children's development dictates two school responsibilities. Schools must be able to respond to a diverse range of abilities in any group of children, and the curriculum in the early grades must provide meaningful contexts for children's learning rather than focusing primarily on isolated skill acquisition.

In order for schools to succeed with every child, NAEYC recommends early intervention and the provision of comprehensive support services to help families provide an environment critical for early learning. Also NAEYC proposes that teachers and administrators receive training in child development so that they can plan and implement a developmentally appropriate curriculum. □

***Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth Through Age 8* (1987).** NAEYC published this report to describe developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs for administrators, teachers, parents, policymakers and others who make decisions about the care and education of young children. It defines early childhood programs as any part- or full-day programs in centers, private and public preschools, kindergartens and primary grade schools, serving children from birth through age eight. NAEYC is concerned that one trend in early childhood education is the increased emphasis on formal instruction in academic skills; it believes this is antithetical to what is known about how children learn.

NAEYC characterizes a high-quality early childhood education program as one providing a safe and nurturing environment that promotes the physical, social, emotional and cognitive development of young children while responding to the needs of families. A major determinant of

"We must provide every child with the firm foundation so critical to school success and we must ensure that schools are prepared to meet the needs of individual children as the arrive at the school door. Only then will our nation be ready to enter the 21st century."

***NAEYC Position Statement on School Readiness*, 1990**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

quality is the extent to which knowledge of child development is applied in program practices. This report presents guidelines about how developmental appropriateness—both age and individual appropriateness—can be applied to four program components: curriculum; adult-child interactions; relations between the program and home; and developmental evaluation of children. These guidelines are discussed in terms of specific age groupings of children: infants and toddlers; four- and five-year-olds; and five- through eight-year-olds.

The final section of the report presents strategies for informing others, including teachers, administrators, the media, legislators, publishers and corporate officials, about what constitutes developmentally appropriate practices and about how they can be implemented. □

***Accreditation Criteria & Procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs* (1984).** The National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, a department of NAEYC, designed its accreditation system to meet two goals: helping early childhood program personnel become involved in a process that will facilitate real and lasting improvements in the quality of programs serving young children, and evaluating the quality of programs for the purpose of accrediting those that function in accordance with the criteria for high-quality programs. The accreditation process is a voluntary one, with a center engaging in a self-study as the first step. After a validation visit from Academy staff and a center report review by a three-person Academy panel, the Academy either grants accreditation or defers it until improvements are made. The report identifies 10 components of group programs for young children and for each component presents a goal statement, rationale and criteria for evaluating whether the goal is being achieved. The 10 components are: interactions among staff and children; curriculum; staff-parent interaction; staff qualifications and development; administration; staffing; physical environment; health and safety; nutrition and food service; and evaluation. □

National Association of Elementary School Principals

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), a professional organization serving 27,000 elementary and middle school principals and other educators in the U.S., Canada and overseas, aims to improve educational quality through professional leadership. Founded in 1921.

Early Childhood Education and the Elementary School Principal: Standards for Quality Programs for Young Children **(1990).** In this report, NAESP outlines basic guidelines for elementary school principals and other groups interested in establishing quality early childhood programs (for children age three to eight) in the public schools. NAESP published the report because of its growing concern that educational programs for children in this age group did not emphasize their unique learning style or their particular developmental needs. It bases its recommendations about standards and quality indicators on generally accepted principles for developmentally appropriate programs:

- **Curriculum.** Principals should provide strong leadership to ensure a curriculum is developed that makes the best use of each child's natural curiosity, abilities and interests. In extended-day or full-day programs, the report recommends an unhurried learning environment for children that reflects a developmental program and resists the inclination to increase academic pressures.

- **Personnel.** In addition to recommending that staff be certified in early childhood education and aware of advanced early childhood philosophy and techniques, NAESP recommends that principals have responsibility for: encouraging all staff to increase their knowledge and skills and to seek higher levels of training; providing professional development opportunities that enable staff to increase their skills and knowledge; articulating the philosophy of the early childhood program and the rationale behind it; assuring the availability of appropriate curriculum and assessment materials and techniques; assembling an appropriately trained and qualified staff; stimulating parent involvement in the program; and arranging collaboration with other community agencies and programs dealing with young children and their families.

- **Parents.** Recognizing the necessity of parent involvement in quality early childhood education, NAESP recommends that the school create a climate where parents: feel welcome and comfortable; believe the school is a nurturing supportive place for their child; feel they can approach the principal and staff with any concerns; have a voice in shaping the school's educational program; are familiar with their rights and responsibilities as members of the community; have sustained communication with staff in a variety of ways; and get information to help them in their roles as parents and first teachers.

"...the design and implementation of an early childhood unit in elementary schools must be adapted to [young] children's particular needs and not simply be patterned after the traditional program of middle and upper grades."

Early Childhood Education and the Elementary School Principal: Standards for Quality Programs for Young Children**, 1990**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- **Community.** The learning experience and general progress of young children will be more productive when there is collaboration among public and private agencies, legislative bodies, civic organizations and concerned businesses. Additionally, NAESP recognizes the importance of serving the child's total needs through comprehensive services and acknowledges that because of changing family circumstances, the school must address more than the academic education of children.

NAESP believes the principal must reach out to other agencies involved with young children through networking, advocacy and collaboration and become an advocate for increased quality child care services in the community. The principal's role in the area of child care includes: maintaining a continuing, documented assessment of the community's child care situation; arranging for the use of school facilities for child care purposes; and working with child care providers in the community to help assure a smooth transition for children to the public school. □

National Association of State Boards of Education

The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), a non-profit association representing state and territorial boards of education, seeks to strengthen state leadership in education policymaking and promote excellence in education. Founded in 1954.

Caring Communities: Supporting Young Children and Families **(1991).** In January 1991, NASBE appointed the National School Readiness Task Force to explore how the nation can achieve the first National Education Goal—to assure that by the year 2000 all children start school ready to learn. Based on a comprehensive review of the current research on school readiness, extensive interviews with early childhood and public school teachers, and guidance from a panel of experts from diverse fields that serve children and families, the Task Force developed a set of recommendations that outline steps local communities can take to assure that all children enter school ready to learn.

The Task Force's definition of school readiness extends beyond academic knowledge to encompass three critical areas of a child's development: physical health, self-confidence and social competence. Additionally, readiness is not based only on the inborn capacities of children but is shaped and developed by the people and environments children encounter, including parents, early childhood programs, schools and communities. Each one of these has a critical role in assuring the healthy development of young children.

The essence of the Task Force's recommendations is the development of "caring communities." It believes that the realization of the education goals depends on community initiative for several reasons. First, at the most basic level, the homes and neighborhoods of a community can provide an environment that either threatens or supports the health and confidence of children and families. Second, the success of programs developed at the federal and state level depends on how they are carried out at the community level. Third, community leaders are close to the problems of young children and families and best able to gauge the value of new early childhood initiatives. In short, communities are the primary force in assuring that families are supported in their efforts to foster children's learning and development.

The Task Force makes two central recommendations about how communities can promote school readiness: provide comprehensive support for young children (from birth to age four) and their families, and improve support for young children and families in public school. The Task Force builds on these two fundamental principles to describe what constitutes a caring community.

Caring communities provide a variety of convenient, affordable and effective services for young children and their families: 1) integrated and comprehensive services, including maternal and child health, nutrition, family support and developmental programs for children; 2) developmentally appropriate practice in full- and half-day centers, family child care homes and public schools; 3) parent-involvement and family-focused policies and services, including parent involvement in developmental programs for children, assistance in locating and selecting early childhood and family support programs, support for parents from employers and voluntary initiatives to strengthen families; and 4) well-trained and adequately compensated staff in early childhood and family support programs. These comprehensive services can be provided by a single agency with varied sources of funding, through linkages among agencies and organizations, or through community-wide collaboration to plan and implement services.

The Task Force's recommendations for public schools focus on both the classroom and the wider community. Primary-grade classrooms

"School readiness is not solely the responsibility of individual parents. Communities have a stake in the healthy development of young children—and an obligation to support families."

***Caring Communities: Supporting Young Children and Families*, 1991**

should combine a high level of expectations, support and engaging activities. Also schools should find more effective ways to relate to families, and other agencies and resources in the community. According to the report, these recommendations can be carried out by incorporating five elements into elementary schools: 1) developmentally appropriate practice, at the center of which is learning through hands-on experience; 2) performance-based assessment; 3) parent involvement and family support, including increased communication with families, opportunities for parents to volunteer in the classroom, education and support for parents, and parental involvement in decision making; 4) intensive and sustained staff development; and 5) comprehensive services for children that address their physical and social needs.

Finally, the Task Force identifies four areas for action to create caring communities:

- Local leadership and planning are needed to build public awareness and create consensus for action.
- Responsive federal policies that allow for more local decision making and resources to implement local plans are needed to empower communities.
- State government leadership is needed to pull together federal and state mandates and funds to create more coherent and flexible local service systems.
- Private sector and voluntary agency commitment is needed to complement public early childhood programs and to build additional sources of support for families.

In conclusion, the report argues that achieving the school readiness goal will benefit children, families, communities and the nation by increasing the physical and emotional health of children, empowering families and creating an educated workforce and citizenry. □

***Joining Forces: A Report from the First Year* (1989).** In 1987, NASBE launched the Joining Forces initiative, a national effort to help the education and human-service sectors work together to aid children and families at risk. Seeing the convergence of reform efforts in education, welfare and child welfare as propitious, NASBE conceived of Joining Forces as a bridge to the formation of new linkages and partnerships.

The initiative began with a Wingspread Conference of educators and human-service program administrators whose discussion is summarized in the report. The next step was a survey of state interagency task forces and other collaborative efforts, which found some level of collaborative activity in every state. After analyzing the factors that prompted collaboration, the report describes four important achievements of interagency cooperation: support from a wider range of partners; improvements in the delivery of existing services; development of new kinds of services; and creation of processes and structures that can support the evolution of broader-based collaboration.

Joining Forces identified four objectives for its future action: foster dialogue among systems through holding forums; collect and disseminate

information on successful examples of collaboration; assist states in the development and evaluation of collaborative approaches; and foster supportive action on the national level by working with other groups. □

***Right from the Start: The Report of the NASBE Task Force on Early Childhood Education* (1988).** Throughout 1988, the NASBE Task Force on Early Childhood Education, composed of leaders from the early childhood community and public education, investigated the current U.S. system of services available to children age four to eight. This report is a summary of Task Force findings and recommendations directed specifically at public school leaders and state policymakers.

Based on its evaluation of the existing system, the Task Force makes two major recommendations: establish early childhood units in elementary schools to provide a framework for working with children age four to eight and a hub for enhanced services for preschool children and their families; and develop partnerships among the public schools, other early childhood programs and community agencies to build coordination and improved services for young children and their families.

The early childhood unit, presented as a model for providing comprehensive services to young children, encompasses developmentally and culturally appropriate curriculum and teaching practice, parent involvement and links with community agencies and institutions. The unit is intended to fill a gap the Task Force noted in other discussions of school reform—a focus on what is known about how children best learn and develop. The Task Force does not promote one particular structure for the early childhood unit but suggests it be molded to the strengths and weaknesses of the current system in a community. However, the report recommends the following as central to the effective functioning of the early childhood unit: developmentally appropriate curriculum; improved assessment; responsiveness to cultural and linguistic diversity; partnerships with parents, family support programs and education services; and training and support for staff and administrators.

The report advocates partnerships among the public schools, other preschool programs and community agencies to provide services to young children and their families, rather than schools as the sole providers of such services. Also, the Task Force suggests the public schools act as ombudspersons for children and their families to ensure they receive needed services and support. The three areas cited in which collaboration can play an essential role are: expanding and improving child care services; improving staff quality; and ensuring comprehensive services to children and families. Significantly, the Task Force recommends schools avoid the distinction between the care and education of young children.

Finally, the report provides a specific set of guidelines for states in three areas: promoting the early childhood unit; promoting collaboration in early childhood services; and financing early childhood services. These guidelines are intended to offer a place from which state policymakers can begin to evaluate current services for young children and families and develop a more effective system. □

National Black Child Development Institute

The National Black Child Development Institute (NBCDI), a national nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the quality of life for black children, focuses on three major policy areas: child care, child welfare and education. Founded in 1970.

Safeguards: Guidelines for Establishing Child Development Programs for Four-Year-Olds in the Public Schools **(1987).** In anticipation of the increased enrollment of black children in early childhood programs run by public schools, NBCDI identified the following 10 safeguards, which detail clear and direct suggestions for ways of ensuring a learning environment for black children that is productive, effective and long lasting in positive outcomes:

- Public school-based programs for black, preschool-age children should incorporate an effective parent-education program.
- Public school-based early childhood programs should involve parents in decisions about curriculum and policy.
- The staff of early childhood education programs should include teachers who come from the community served by the program and who are racially and ethnically representative of the children served.
- Teachers in public school-based programs should be required to have specific training in preschool education and/or ongoing, in-service training provided by qualified staff.
- Curriculum for preschool-age children in the public schools should be culturally sensitive and appropriate to the child's age and level of development.
- Public schools that house programs for very young children should meet the same health and safety standards that apply to independent preschools and center-based child care programs.
- Public school-based early childhood programs should participate in federal and state programs that guarantee adequate nutrition to children.
- Administrators of public school-based programs for preschoolers should ensure that children entering the programs have access to appropriate health care.
- In assessing children of preschool age, the administrators of public school-based early childhood programs should not limit their assessment to, or base their program planning solely on, standardized tests.
- Public school-based early childhood programs should be subject to a regular, external review by community members and early childhood development experts. □

Child Care in the Public Schools: Incubator for Inequality? **(1985).** This report, which resulted from a meeting of NBCDI national affiliate organizations with education and child care experts, outlines the concerns of advocates for black children and documents those aspects of the public school system that are inadequate to meet the new responsibilities of very young children and, specifically, the needs of black children. NBCDI expresses concern about the dearth of available data on the potential benefits or disadvantages of merging the delivery of education and child care services.

This report puts the child care problems of black families in context. Although the need for child care is not a new phenomenon in the black community, in recent years the decreasing availability of informal care by relatives or other community members, combined with an increased competition for space in regulated child

"While the poverty rate among white children dropped between 1983 and 1984, the poverty rate among Black children hit an all time high—51.1 percent. These economic constraints put Black families at an enormous financial disadvantage just when they are forced to purchase child care services....Will a solution to the child care crisis which calls on public schools provide answers that will solve the Black child care crisis?...Or will it...increase the economic disparity between white families and Black families by either pricing Black families out of the child care system or creating a separate and unequal child care program for the poor?"

***Child Care in the Public Schools: Incubator for Inequality?*, 1985**

care, has resulted in less available child care for black families. Economic support for many low-income black families also decreased dramatically during the 1980s due to the elimination of subsidies such as those provided by Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

NBCDI expresses concern about the increasingly popular reliance on existing public school systems to compensate for the lack of quality affordable child care. The report questions whether using the public schools as child care providers will decrease the diversity of child care options, such as family day care, in-home care and group care, presently used by black families.

Another potential problem is whether an expanded public school system will receive enough funding to ensure that black children receive care equal to that of majority children and are not stigmatized by the source of their care. In the past, funding patterns for urban school programs, which benefit minorities as primary users, were inadequate.

A third concern is whether public school programs will be sensitive to cultural diversity and ensure that black children's heritage is incorporated into the program. NBCDI believes that existing public school child care proposals pay insufficient attention to child development and even less to community needs and cultural values that bear on a child's development. Since public schools traditionally socialize all children to maintain and convey majority community standards (white middle-class values), school-involved child care programs could ignore the minority child and his or her family's orientation. Additionally, the public school relies heavily on testing and tracking, which negatively affect black school-age children and would have further detrimental effects on preschool children.

Economic pressure from inadequate funding could also result in filling slots for early childhood programs with teachers who hold tenure but who are not qualified to provide care for preschoolers. To assure a stable environment for the black preschool child, both consistency in caregivers achieved through high salaries and cultural diversity of providers are essential.

NBCDI believes that the public school system must seek out and welcome parental and community participation and support to bridge the gap between the black child's home and school environment. Public and private partnerships can also strengthen the delivery of services to black children and families. NBCDI will only support proposals for public school child care if they are the product of national discussion, careful planning and consultation with black advocates and early childhood experts. Without extensive research and dialogue, NBCDI fears that the mistakes and inadequacies of the existing public school system will be repeated in its child care programs. □

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Child Care Association

The National Child Care Association (NCCA), a nonprofit trade association representing approximately 4,500 private proprietary licensed child care centers, works to promote the growth and safeguard the interests of quality private child care in the U.S. Founded in 1987.

***Perspective on Publicly Funded Pre-K Child Care Programs in the Public Schools* (1991).** In this policy paper, NCCA presents four arguments against the exclusive provision of preschool and school-age child care in the public schools. The first is economic. NCCA argues that publicly funded, school-based child care for three- and four-year-olds will make infant and toddler care substantially more costly and, therefore, unavailable for most parents. The basis of this argument is that now providers tend to subsidize the cost of providing labor-intensive, costly infant and toddler care with surpluses earned from the less labor-intensive care of older preschoolers. Providers will go out of business under this scenario, giving public schools a monopoly on care of three- and four-year-olds.

The second argument, related to the first, is about parental choice. If the public schools become the primary provider of care for preschool and school-age children, driving affordable competition out of business, parents' options will be severely limited.

The third argument focuses on the psychological and educational ramifications of public school programs for preschoolers. Citing the research of some child development experts, NCCA concludes that the formal, academic atmosphere and curriculum of public schools do not promote, and may even inhibit, the psychological and educational development of young children.

NCCA's fourth argument relates to the quality of locally funded pre-kindergarten public school programs. The report notes recent research showing that the quality of public school programs is sub-standard in many critical areas, including teacher preparation, program content and parent involvement.

In conclusion, NCCA states that the movement to provide child care in the public schools is based on an exaggerated and idealistic view of the potential of public school facilities as a community resource. Rather, NCCA favors the existence of a wide variety of child care options, arguing that competition is the best path to quality. □

"Not only did Congress explicitly refrain from mandating or expressing a preference for Pre-K child care programs in the public schools, the proliferation of such programs as a national public policy is unwarranted and unwise on economical, psychological, educational and evaluative grounds...such an unfair, anti-competitive public policy would be harmful to the children...limit parent choice, reduce the available supply of child care and unjustly use the taxes of legitimate, established, tax paying private child care center owners to put them out of business."

***Perspective on Publicly Funded Pre-K Child Care Programs in the Public Schools*, 1991**

National Coalition for an Urban Children's Agenda

The National Coalition for an Urban Children's Agenda (NCUCA), an association of 10 national organizations (American Public Welfare Association, Child Welfare League of America, Children's Defense Fund, Council of Chief State School Officers, Council of Great City Schools, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Conference of State Legislators, National Governors' Association, National Urban League, United States Conference of Mayors) concerned about children and families specifically or about public policy in general, employs the resources of its member organizations to advance a united front for improving the welfare of children living in cities. Founded in 1989.

Implementing the Children's Agenda: Critical Elements of System-Wide Reform **(1990).** In this publication, NCUCA explores some of the problems facing children and families in the nation's cities; outlines an urban children's agenda; defines the essential elements of a reform plan to address this agenda; and provides examples of promising service-delivery models.

Among the disturbing trends identified by NCUCA is rising child poverty, which increased 20 percent from 1979 to 1986, from under 10 million to over 12 million children. Related problems include the increasing numbers of single-parent households and families where both parents work; rising health concerns in cities, especially AIDS and drug-related problems; fiscal crises confronting many city governments; high dropout rates; and inadequate service-delivery systems. Although NCUCA recognizes that these problems are not confined to cities, it believes an urban focus is appropriate because large numbers of children are concentrated in cities, the school and human-service systems of cities are the most seriously stressed, and the condition of urban children affects the entire society.

For NCUCA, the essence of a children's agenda is that all the needs of young people and their families are addressed by forging changes in the way human-service systems operate. It means recognizing that the needs of children and families for education, health care, housing and family support, among others, are not isolated but interconnected. It means meeting these needs not through the separate services of disparate agencies but through reconfiguring the current systems or creating new ones that are more effective. Finally, it means that success or failure must be judged in terms of the outcomes achieved for children and families.

NCUCA advocates that all human-service systems be reframed so that they incorporate the following:

- Clearly defined outcomes and rewards, giving incentives to providers to improve service quality.
- A child-centered approach.
- Comprehensive services for children and families.

"Urban policymakers, service providers and educators cannot work in isolation from families, communities and state structures and have any hope of solving the problems that currently plague urban areas."

***Implementing the Children's Agenda: Critical Elements of System-Wide Reform*, 1990**

- Economic stability for children and families.
- Interagency collaboration in providing services.
- Systemic change in schools and other institutions that serve the needs of children.
- Emphasis on prevention of problems before intervention is necessary.
- Community solutions to community problems.
- Federal and state fiscal and leadership support for locally developed solutions.

Using the children's agenda as a new comprehensive way of thinking about solutions to the problems of urban schools and neighborhoods, NCUCA emphasizes that policymakers, service providers and educators must work with families, communities and state structures to solve the problems that plague urban areas. Additionally, in discussing strategies for achieving reform, NCUCA underlines the importance of defining goals and outcomes, developing appropriate assessments of success and using incentives for service providers if they succeed and, if they fail, sanctions ranging from loss of autonomy to loss of jobs. Finally, NCUCA considers staff training and development, adequate resources and their efficient use, and effective governance critical elements of outcome-based systems serving children and families.

After acknowledging the difficulties involved, NCUCA advocates collaboration and coordination as essential to effective, efficient service-delivery systems. It also identifies the following as important components of systemic change that will result in better outcomes for urban children and families: charismatic leaders; demonstration projects; money; lawsuits; labor contracts; executive actions; and legislation.

Recognizing several key obstacles to cooperation among local, state and federal agencies, NCUCA emphasizes that much progress can be achieved if state and federal officials provide leadership and funding for local initiatives to address the needs of children and argues that sustained change also requires carefully designed legislation, regulations and/or administrative actions with the force of law. Such actions are most likely to drive change at all levels of government, particularly if they focus on defined goals, measurable outcomes, collaborative use of resources and increased professional development. □

National Commission on Children

The National Commission on Children (NCC) is a bipartisan commission appointed by the President, the President *pro tempore* of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and chaired by Senator Jay Rockefeller (D-WV). Its initial purpose, as defined by law, was to conduct a study of the condition of American children's lives, and to propose ways to meet children's needs at the federal level. Established in 1987.

***Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families* (1991).** In this final report, NCC evaluates the status of children in American society and considers how health, education, social support, income-security and tax-policy reforms at the federal level could meet children's needs. The chief problems identified are the high child-poverty rate (NCC observes that "today, children are the poorest Americans"); the growing gap between rich and poor; the changing structure of the American family as more women enter the work force and single-parent households become increasingly common; the failure of American students to compete academically with students from other countries, a failure linked to American industry's non-competitiveness in the world economy; and the predicted surge in the elderly population, which will burden the American economy if growth cannot sufficiently compensate for the rise in Social Security payments. NCC believes that improving the well-being and academic performance of American children is essential to future economic growth.

Principles for action that provide theoretical support for NCC's proposals are set forth, including:

- Every American child should have the opportunity to develop to his or her full potential.
- Community institutions—schools, religious organizations, service and charitable organizations, and employers—have an important role in creating an environment that is supportive of parents and children.
- Society has a legitimate interest in childrearing and a moral obligation to intervene whenever parents who fail to meet their responsibilities put their children at risk.
- Preventing problems before they become crises is the best and least costly way to address the needs of troubled families and vulnerable children.
- Effectively addressing the needs of America's children and families will require a significant commitment of time, leadership and financial resources by individuals, the private sector and government at all levels.
- Cultural diversity is one of America's greatest riches. It must be respected and preserved, while at the same time ensuring that all children have an equal opportunity to enter the social and economic mainstream.

Although these principles emphasize societal responsibility for the needs of children, NCC also concludes that primary responsibility for taking care of children lies with the family, and that family structure and moral education are crucial to a child's development. Therefore, it is in society's best interests to support parents in their childrearing roles, enable them to fulfill their obligations and hold them responsible for the care and support of their children.

NCC makes recommendations in several areas, including: ensuring income security; improving health care; increasing educational achievement; preparing adolescents for adulthood; strengthening and supporting families; protecting vulnerable children and their families; making policies

"...the present system of human services generally fails to meet the needs of...seriously troubled families...families seeking assistance often encounter a service delivery system that is confusing, difficult to navigate, and indifferent to their concerns."

***Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families*, 1991**

and programs work; and creating a moral climate for children. Because NCC believes that coherent national policies for children and families will require both a greater emphasis on family values and more effective intervention, the recommendations are directed to the public and private sectors and to individuals and institutions.

In terms of federal funding, NCC describes a $52-56 billion federal package to assist children and families. The two costliest recommendations are that the federal government should: 1) grant a $1,000 refundable tax credit, or $1,000 refund for low-income families who do not have to pay taxes, for all children up to age 18 and 2) work with private employers to grant universal health insurance to pregnant women and children under 18. The cost of the former would be somewhat offset by eliminating the personal tax exemption for dependent children.

Regarding education policy, NCC encourages school curriculum and finance reform and recommends that schools improve accountability to parents and establish incentives to attract and keep qualified teachers. After endorsing the concept of school-based management and recommending experimentation with school choice, NCC leaves primary responsibility in these areas to communities and state governments, with the federal government providing a strong leadership role but limited funds.

Similarly, NCC makes few recommendations for federal action concerning child care, although it advocates developing and enforcing tougher standards for child care at the state level, and a majority of Commission members strongly support a federally mandated family leave policy for the public and private sectors.

Proposals for federal funding for parents and young children include $50 million each year above the amount authorized under the 1990 Child Care and Development Block Grant to improve access to affordable, quality child care; $1 billion over five years for family support programs, with an additional $1 billion provided by non-federal sources; an annual $1.04 billion increase in the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); and full funding of the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant.

On the state and local level, NCC recommends that government, communities and employers continue to improve the availability, affordability and quality of child care services for all children and families that need them. Emphasizing that all levels of government should coordinate policies to serve the needs of families and children more efficiently, NCC believes that a more child-oriented, comprehensive approach to providing services is crucial for achieving long-range success.

NCC makes no specific recommendations regarding linkage between child care and education policy. However, NCC does propose a $.834 to $4.024 billion increase in Head Start, the exact cost to be determined by the percentage of three-, four- and five-year-olds to be served, and the number of years each child is enrolled in the program.

In conclusion, NCC observes that every sector of society benefits from caring, competent and literate citizens, and every individual has a direct stake in seeing that all children are able to develop to their full potential. □

National Conference of State Legislatures

The National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL), which serves the legislators and staffs of the nation's states, commonwealths and territories, has three objectives: improve the quality and effectiveness of state legislatures; foster interstate communication and cooperation; and ensure a strong, cohesive voice in the federal system. Founded in 1975.

***Child Care and Early Childhood Education Policy: A Legislator's Guide* (1989).** This report, written by M. Therese Gnezda and Shelley L. Smith for state legislators, focuses on the vital connection between quality child care and early childhood education and the economic well-being of the states and the nation. It presents an in-depth look at state child care and early childhood education policies with an emphasis on their relationship to the economy; provides a framework for state lawmakers who are considering child care and early childhood education policies; outlines the range of existing state legislation; describes two states' initiatives; and provides suggestions for the integration of child care and early childhood education policies on the state level.

The authors note that traditionally, state legislatures have considered child care and early childhood education distinct services. Child care was viewed as a service for parents while they were working, in training or in educational programs. It provided either custodial care, in which there was no philosophical framework guiding the program, or developmental care, which was based on principles of child development and provided care that supplied enriching experiences for the child. Typically the state's role in child care was to provide a supportive service to low-income or welfare mothers.

Early childhood education, on the other hand, was viewed as a service for children to promote development through enriching activities. Although most early childhood programs are either federally funded or privately operated, states have recently increased their involvement in this area, primarily with programs for children at risk of academic and social failure.

The authors propose that child care and early childhood education be integrated into a complete and coordinated system. They note that state policymakers are increasingly considering the potential benefits of expanding and coordinating child care and early childhood education policies under a comprehensive approach to state economic development. This is a difficult task, requiring the coordination of numerous agencies in separate child care and early childhood education service-delivery systems; federal, state, and/or local administrative entities and funding streams; licensing agencies; teacher training institutions; resource-and-referral programs; and a variety of public and private providers. Despite the challenges this coordinated approach presents, it ensures that all children in child care and early childhood education settings receive enriched learning experiences as a foundation for later productivity, and also provides parents with the critical support needed to become self-sufficient, productive citizens.

The authors identify the following three child care policy areas and specific initiatives that state legislators should consider:

- **Policies that reduce the cost of child care.** Direct subsidies to low-income families; tax credits or deductions for child care expenses; tax incentives for employers who assist their employees with child care; and direct child care assistance for state employees.

- **Policies that promote quality, expansion and accessibility of child care.** Regulation and monitoring of child care; salary increases for child care providers in state-operated programs; financial support and implementation of training programs for child care

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Traditionally, legislatures have handled child care and early childhood policies independently of each other....But now many states are considering early childhood programs for at-risk children, and to promote family self-sufficiency, many state welfare reform proposals address the child care needs of welfare recipients. The overlapping interests of children at risk and some welfare families present a unique opportunity for state legislators to integrate policies for both of these groups."

***Child Care and Early Childhood Education Policy: A Legislator's Guide*, 1989**

providers; financial support of resource and referral networks to aid families in locating child care; training for providers; assistance to employers in implementing child care programs for their employees; direct assistance to providers to help pay for operating costs, including liability insurance; loan or grant programs for start-up, construction or renovation of child care facilities; and tax incentives for facility expansion or renovation.

- **Policies that support parents in education and training programs.** Child care subsidies for parents while they participate in welfare-to-work programs; subsidies for transitional child care during the early months of employment for parents who have completed welfare-to-work programs; funding of child care assistance for teenage parents, including school-based child care programs; child care assistance as part of adult literacy programs; and subsidies for low-income parents enrolled in high school equivalency, vocational education, and undergraduate and graduate programs.

The report emphasizes that action by state lawmakers is vital to improving the quality and affordability of child care and early childhood education, and calls on legislators to consider a wide range of policy options to improve child care and early childhood education programs, including: guarantee consistency and high quality in early childhood programs, regardless of setting, through appropriate regulatory standards, teacher/provider training and qualifications, and program design; reduce the costs of child care for parents; increase the supply of child care and early childhood education services; increase program accessibility for parents; and promote private-sector involvement so that the responsibility to assist families is shared between employers and the state.

In conclusion, the authors believe that money spent on quality child care programs will save money in the end by increasing the well-being of children and families as well as by strengthening state economies. □

National Council of Jewish Women

The National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), a membership organization of 100,000 volunteers, provides services to families of all socio-economic, ethnic and religious backgrounds. Founded in 1893.

The Hard Questions in Family Day Care: National Issues and Exemplary Programs **(1990).** This report, published by NCJW's National Family Day Care Project, resulted from a symposium held in 1989 to explore critical issues in family day care and identify promising programs and practices. Among the issues discussed are: recruitment and retention, training, and promoting quality and professionalism in family day care.

Although all of the issues are complex and provoke what NCJW calls hard questions, regulatory standards present particularly difficult choices. Because there are no federal standards or regulations, state regulatory activities are especially important. NCJW sees the challenge of family day care regulations as the need to protect the rights of children in care and their families as well as the rights of providers and their families. If standards are too lax, children may be at risk; if standards are too tough, providers may go out of business or avoid registration.

As for funding, NCJW calls for initiatives in state government, particularly for low-income families, that utilize all available funding sources and allow funds to follow the child. NCJW also suggests group plans that could reduce the cost of both liability and health benefits for providers and an expansion of subsidies for parents in need.

In summary, NCJW advocates a long-term perspective in expanding the supply and increasing the quality of family day care because child care is an ongoing national need. Government and the private sector both have a stake in building a supply of quality child care in every community. Government should engage in comprehensive planning, change tax policies to support child care at a higher level and raise reimbursement rates for providers. Businesses should support child care through partnerships with each other and with government to leverage more funds for child care. □

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"The children are the unwitting victims of this situation [the current under-funding of the child care system]. They spend long hours with underpaid caregivers and suffer the loss when providers and other children move in and out of their lives on an all-too-frequent basis. It is their needs that must primarily determine the solutions to the child care crisis."

***The Hard Questions in Family Day Care: National Issues and Exemplary Programs*, 1990**

National Education Association

The National Education Association (NEA), an organization of more than 2,000,000 public elementary and secondary teachers, higher education faculty, educational support personnel, retired faculty and students preparing to become teachers, works to elevate the character and interests of the profession of teaching and promote the cause of education in the U.S. Founded in 1857.

Advancing the Nation's Education Agenda **(1991).** In this series of policy papers, NEA expresses its commitment to achieving the National Education Goals.

To realize Goal 1, the school-readiness goal, NEA believes state and federal governments will have to cooperate to provide better access to prenatal care, including proper nutrition, as well as to parenting education, quality and affordable health care, services for homeless children, child care programs adequate to serve all eligible children, and public education available to children beginning at age three.

NEA presses for adoption of the following principles for excellence, which it believes are necessary to achieve the national goals: student mastery of what is taught; full learning opportunity available for all students; learning throughout life; authority vested in the local faculty; a school staff that is professionally compensated; high standards for teacher preparation and practice; school/community resources coordinated to benefit students; and adequate financial support for education.

NEA would like to hold schools, as well as federal, state and local government and families, accountable for achieving the goals. To focus school improvement efforts, NEA created the National Center for Innovations, whose work includes: school restructuring projects in 15 school districts, with expansion planned to include one project in each state; development of exemplary programs; and the redesign of teacher education programs in partnership with universities. □

Early Childhood Education and the Public Schools **(1990).** In the fall of 1989, the NEA Board of Directors authorized the Standing Committee on Instruction and Professional Development to "develop and recommend for adoption principles and/or policy positions that can guide the development of effective public school programs in early childhood education." The Committee reviewed the status of early childhood education through an examination of current materials and engaged in discussions with three experts. The policy positions and program standards recommended by the Committee were adopted by the Board of Directors in May 1990 and are summarized in this report.

The report's principal assertion is that the public schools are and should be a primary provider of early childhood services for preschool, kindergarten and primary school children—children age three to eight. NEA believes that states should mandate early childhood education programs in public schools for three- and four-year-olds and supports states in their efforts to promote the work of community agencies in identifying and placing in such programs children who would benefit the most—children at risk of later school failure. Making a distinction between care and education, NEA views the current system of care as "complex, variable, and changing," resulting in deficiencies in and competition among existing services.

NEA concedes that there is debate about the role of the public schools in providing early childhood services. However, the report emphasizes that the following strengths make public schools an excellent choice as the primary provider of early childhood services. Public schools are universal; regularly and publicly accountable; a

"...*all* education is developmental in nature...education spans an individual's lifetime, from birth to death."

***Early Childhood Education and the Public Schools*, 1990**

recognized socializing agent; and singular and established infrastructures enabling funds to be easily channeled and economies or efficiencies of scale to be realized. Furthermore, public schools help children to benefit from the connection among various developmental, educational and institutional levels in the schooling process; are staffed by the most stable and highly credentialed workforce; and are already engaged in systematic restructuring efforts that will require consensus building and broad community involvement.

NEA believes the current school reform movement will play a crucial role in making the public schools an appropriate environment for early childhood education, particularly through changes in such areas as staff:child ratios and the adoption of developmentally appropriate teaching methods. Recognizing that quality is essential to effective early childhood programs, NEA supports the criteria for developmentally appropriate programs established by the National Association for the Education of Young Children. NEA also promotes high-quality preschool programs as a means by which preschool children, particularly those at risk, can make gains in future school performance, employment and social and emotional adjustment. To provide quality early childhood programs in the public schools, NEA recommends that the following criteria be considered in program implementation:

- The needs of both parent and child must be addressed, including the provision of full-day programs. Early childhood programs must also take into consideration the specific needs of the community in which the school is located.
- High-quality programming should properly integrate day care and education components and be supported by the resources and staff necessary to accomplish the delivery of both kinds of services.
- Teachers and administrators should complete a specialized preparation program and hold a distinct state-issued license to practice.
- Training at district expense should be provided in developmentally appropriate curricula for teaching, administrative and support staff.
- Assessment methods used in early childhood programs should be geared to the child's developmental level. Norm-referenced standardized tests are inappropriate, as are the practices of ability grouping and retention.
- Compensation for teaching, administrative and support staff working in early childhood programs should be equal to and determined by the same standards established for other district personnel in similar positions.
- Partnerships between parents and teachers must be developed so that parents have a voice in the design, delivery and evaluation of all services provided.
- Funding for programs should come from new sources and be the shared responsibility of national, state and local governments.
- Public schools should assume the role of a coordinating agency for all community services relevant to the needs of parents and young children, including diagnostic services, training and networking.

In the current context of reform, NEA envisions taking a leadership role in the early childhood education field because of its extensive experience with education issues and the power of its organized voice in effecting change. Urging its members to take a more active external leadership role and join in coalitions with other early childhood education advocates, NEA recommends that members work at the federal, state and local levels to: collect and disseminate information, seek out new financing streams, review licensing standards and procedures, and support the development of model programs.□

isions
lhood
xperi-
of its
ng its
eader-
early
ecom-
state
minate
reams,
s, and
ms.□

National Education Goals Panel

The National Educational Goals Panel (NEGP) consists of six Governors, four members of the federal executive branch and three Congressional leaders appointed to measure progress made towards achieving the six goals defined at the 1989 Education Summit. Established in 1990.

The National Educational Goals Report: Building a Nation of Learners **(1991).** This report is the first of the 10 annual "report cards" NEGP will issue measuring progress toward the six National Education Goals. Acknowledging its inability to evaluate success toward the first goal—school readiness—because of the lack of appropriate standards, NEGP considers establishing a national early childhood system to evaluate children's physical, emotional, social and intellectual development as they enter school.

The report summarizes statistics on participation in preschool programs, finding that enrollment of children from low-income families is significantly lower than that of children from high-income families. Federal programs that provide for the education, health and nutrition of young children (Head Start, Medicaid for Children, and Women, Infants and Children Program (WIC)), are described, and charts show the number of children benefiting from and dollars allotted to these programs over the past three years. □

"In 1991, only about four out of every ten 3- to 5-year-olds from families with incomes of $30,000 or less were enrolled in preschool."

***The National Educational Goals Report*, 1991**

National Elementary School Center

The National Elementary School Center (NESC) is a non-profit membership organization whose advocacy efforts, research and collaborative programs are designed to improve the quality of life for all children and teachers in elementary schools. Founded in 1985.

***The School as Locus of Advocacy for All Children* (1989).** In this publication, NESC proposes a new concept for the elementary school—the school as the locus of advocacy for all children. This approach is based on the following principles:

- Adults in our society have moral and social obligations to meet the fundamental needs and protect the fundamental rights of all our children.
- When all elements in a child's life support the child's development, growth and learning are enhanced.
- A holistic approach is required in looking at and in supporting the child's life as a totality.
- The fragmentation and breakdown of traditional institutions that children, youth and families have depended on in the past for support have created a serious void; a designated locus for advocacy is required to mobilize our local, state and national resources on behalf of our children.
- The school must be redesigned to serve as that locus of advocacy; it is the natural, strategic and available social agency to act as ombudsperson, broker and advocate for all children.
- Systemic and fundamental changes in the goals and functions of American education are required for the new role of child advocacy.

NESC defines the school's advocacy role as accepting responsibility for mobilizing available resources and generating new ones as needed—not providing all necessary services. To develop better service-delivery systems, NESC recommends coalitions or compacts of individuals and groups spearheaded by the schools, with each community configuring its coalition and developing its plan according to local factors. However, NESC believes that the following guidelines are fundamental to the implementation of the school-advocate concept:

- Local and state governing structures must accept the school system as the locus of advocacy for children.
- Child advocacy applies to all families in a community, regardless of socioeconomic status.
- Pervasive commitment to the concept is evident in the planning and allocation of resources.
- The complementary roles of families and schools in working together on behalf of

"As the only institution in our society reaching all children, the elementary school is the appropriate locus for change. We believe that the elementary school should be redefined, then restructured to respond to the needs and rights of today's children."

***The School as Locus of Advocacy for All Children*, 1989**

children are acknowledged.

- Coalition building with community and outside resources is ongoing.
- Change is viewed as a process, not a single event.
- Changes in structure and functioning of schools are viewed as proactive, intrinsic and systemic rather than reactive or incremental.
- Respect for differences and diversity exists among all students, school personnel and administrators. □

National Governors' Association

The National Governors' Association (NGA), an organization of the Governors of the 50 states and the American commonwealths and territories, is concerned with shaping policies both at the state and national level. Founded in 1908.

Every Child Ready for School **(1992).** This report, the work of an Action Team of Governors and business leaders developing strategies for meeting the first National Education Goal, is designed to guide reform efforts and to stimulate the interest and involvement of Governors and other policymakers, corporate leaders, educators, parents and social-service providers.

The Action Team on Readiness asserts that children are the nation's most valuable resource. Although their education determines the nation's vitality and research has identified the factors contributing to a child's readiness for school, many children still reach school unprepared for the academic environment. To change this, the Action Team urges statewide systemic reform to provide a continuum of community-based, family-centered, prevention-oriented services to children and their families, suggesting that policymakers and the general public begin by: accepting the premise that all children can learn and that environments are needed to nurture, support and sustain them from the prenatal period throughout school; developing a common vision of school readiness across education, health and social-service systems; promoting collaborative efforts to translate the vision of school readiness into reality; ensuring that these efforts maximize both limited resources and opportunities for families to have access to services; and implementing outcome-based accountability systems throughout child-serving systems to ensure results.

The Action Team identifies specific factors that enhance school readiness and benchmarks that states can use to measure their progress. The benchmarks are based on several overarching principles: every child should be physically, socially, emotionally and cognitively ready for school; schools must be ready for all children by being more responsive to the wide range of backgrounds, experiences, languages and needs of the children they serve; programs and services should be examined in terms of quality, availability, accessibility and actual use; and, where appropriate, each benchmark should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, family status and gender to provide a clearer picture of the status of children's readiness for school.

The following objectives and benchmarks are proposed for the readiness goal:

- **Objective 1. All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs that help prepare children for school.**

  Benchmarks: Percentage of children between the ages of zero and five participating in public and private preschool and public and private child care programs; percentage of children participating in programs that are accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children or the National Association of Family Day Care, or that meet comparable state standards, and/or percentage of children participating in programs where the majority of staff possess Child Development Associate credentials; percentage of eligible children enrolled in Head Start and public preschool programs; percentage of eligible children who are participating in free or subsidized child care programs; and percentage of eligible children between the ages of zero and five with special needs who are being served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

"The natural question is how [school readiness] programs will be paid for. There are two answers. First, states and communities can maximize resources through coordination....Various mechanisms have been adopted by states and localities to address service fragmentation, including creation of cabinet-level agencies for children and families, establishment of interagency commissions and task forces for children, enhanced cross-training of staff both within agencies and across agency boundaries, pooled funding to support local initiatives, and strong leadership of Governors and other policymakers....Second,...It is estimated that each dollar spent today on at-risk children to prevent educational failure will produce long-term savings to society."

***Every Child Ready for School*, 1992**

- **Objective 2. Every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day to helping his or her preschool child learn; parents will have access to the training and support they need.**

  Benchmarks: Percentage of communities with family support and education services, such as Parents as Teachers, family resource centers, or the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters; percentage of school-age parents (below age 20) who are receiving comprehensive services, e.g., child care, parenting education, counseling, health services and social services; and percentage of children between the ages of zero and five who experience consecutive or multiple out-of-home placements such as placement in foster care.

- **Objective 3. Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, and the numbers of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.**

  Benchmarks: Percentage of low-birthweight (less than 5.5 pounds) and very low-birthweight (less than 3.3 pounds) babies; percentage of pregnant women receiving prenatal care during the first trimester; percentage of women below age 20 who give birth; percentage of children who are fully immunized by age two; percentage of all children below age five covered by Medicaid's Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment program or private health insurance; and percentage of eligible parents in the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC).

The Action Team advocates comprehensive programs and services that are preventive and family oriented. In response to the critical question of funding for such programs, the Action Team suggests two approaches. First, states and communities can maximize resources through coordination on the state and local level with cabinet-level agencies for children and families; interagency commissions and task forces for children; cross-training of staff both within and between agencies; and pooling funds to support local initiatives.

Second, states and communities must recognize that an investment in children is a good economic and social policy. Dollars spent on prenatal and well-child care, family support activities and quality preschool programs are a preventative investment. The Action Panel concludes that investment in the youngest, most at-risk children will provide the largest returns not only for the individual but also for society. □

***Educating America: State Strategies for Achieving the National Education Goals* (1990).** Because education is critical to national prosperity, President Bush and the nation's Governors

met at the 1989 Education Summit to establish a set of performance goals for U.S. education. This report describes the NGA's strategies for meeting these goals on both the state and national levels.

NGA emphasizes that, although primary responsibility for meeting the goals lies with the states, they cannot be achieved by state government alone. Rather, success depends on the active support and involvement of teachers, parents, administrators, school board members, professionals who provide early childhood health and social services, and the business community. NGA calls on the federal government to take significant responsibility, including financial support for programs serving young, at-risk children.

In the section on preschool years, NGA decries the "growing crisis in the equity, quality, and affordability of early childhood services," citing the following statistics as obstacles to achieving Goal 1—the readiness goal: in 1987, almost 25 percent of pregnant women did not receive prenatal care in the first trimester; in 1985, less than one third of children whose family income was below $10,000 were in preschool; and in 1988, the turnover rate for child care workers was 40 percent. In response to these conditions, NGA developed strategies for better preparing young children for school:

- **Give every baby a healthy start in life and every child a healthy start in school.** Improve and expand access to prenatal and well-child care; ensure that all young children receive comprehensive health screening and services; and develop collaborative strategies to fund and deliver services.

- **Equip parents to support their child's development and learning.** Offer quality support and education services to parents; give every child high-quality, developmental early education and care services in a setting of the parents' choice; increase access to affordable, high-quality services; improve quality in all types of early care and education; provide better information to parents about available programs; and support a quality workforce for early childhood programs.

- **Build connections among early childhood services.** Coordinate funding, planning and standards for related federal and state programs; initiate local models of collaborative, continuous services; support private-sector early childhood initiatives; and educate and involve the public in school-readiness efforts.

- **Make public schools more supportive of kindergarten and primary-grade children.** Welcome parents as equal partners in children's learning and schooling; improve student-assessment and school-entry policies; and improve responsiveness to the varied learning styles and diversity of young learners.

To facilitate quality early childhood experiences for children and their families, NGA advises collaboration among a number of players, including local, state and federal governments, the media, and a variety of public and private organizations. For example, states could eliminate bureaucratic overlap by establishing direct links among health, education and social-service agencies, which could jointly provide new programs for young children. Also, state, local and federal agencies could coordinate funding of related child care/school-readiness programs, such as state early childhood programs and Head Start. NGA believes that by successfully coordinating services at the state level, state governments can improve educational quality while preserving the accountability and diversity that exist under local control. □

***Results in Education: 1990* (1990).** In this final report of state progress in education reform since 1986, the Governors describe some of the critical lessons learned. They observe that progress has been made in getting children ready for school and ensuring the success of at-risk children who are already enrolled in school. They report that

many states and local school districts have developed innovative programs to enhance the chances for success of at-risk students; for

example, two thirds of the states have developed early childhood education and parenting pro

However, despite the development of many model and exemplary programs, states still have a long way to go in ensuring success and higher levels of achievement for all students. The Governors state that current programs promote marginal rather than systemic improvement; for example, the majority of preschool programs are pilot programs targeted to four-year-olds and are not statewide. States must move beyond a one-program approach to a comprehensive restructuring of the education system.

The Governors note that many states have or are creating interagency task forces to serve more effectively the multiple needs of children and families. Health, education and social-service agencies are working together to design prevention and intervention programs for at-risk students. Many states encourage collaboration by appointing high-level coordinating councils, earmarking resources for districts willing to develop innovative programs and attempting to eliminate bureaucratic barriers to collaboration, such as duplicative eligibility forms. Additionally, many states have increased access to social-service programs by integrating services at the school site.

The Governors assert that states have a critical role in developing programs that prevent the onset of problems leading to school failure. States must take the lead in identifying at-risk children and providing comprehensive care to them and their parents, including ensuring that more children are served by quality early childhood education programs. Emphasizing the importance of an integrated approach when serving at-risk children and their families, the Governors urge all state policymakers to provide incentives, including funding mechanisms, that foster partnerships both within and outside government. □

***Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education* (1986).** This publication, resulting from a series of meetings the Governors held in 1985 on critical issues affecting the quality of education, identified recommendations for education reform and called for achieving at least 75 percent of them by 1991. This is the first in a series of five annual reports on state progress in implementing the recommendations, which were precursors of the National Education Goals developed in 1989.

A Task Force on Readiness, one of seven established, looked at what states can and should do to help children who, without additional intervention, will not succeed in school. Recognizing the importance of sound early childhood experiences and support services, the Task Force recommends that states:

- Develop outreach initiatives using all community and religious organizations to assist at-risk young children;
- Provide in-home assistance for first-time, low-income, parents of high-risk infants;
- Provide quality early childhood development programs for at-risk four-year-olds and, where feasible, three-year-olds;

"At least six major scientific longitudinal studies have indicated that good preschool programs for at-risk children help prevent school failure....The early years of a child's life are the foundation upon which all skills will be built. If there are weaknesses in this foundation, early detection and correction are essential to future growth and learning."

***Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education*, 1986**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Provide kindergarten for all five-year-olds;
- Provide all interested parents of preschool children with information on successful parenting practices.
- Stress continued improvement of developmental and educational programs in child care centers, including staff development and in-service training and accreditation for centers; and
- Develop state and local structures through which various agencies work together to provide appropriate programs for young children and their parents. □

National Head Start Association

The National Head Start Association (NHSA), a membership organization representing 450,000 children, 80,000 staff and 1,900 Head Start programs, seeks to nurture and advocate for its children, families and staff and to provide training and professional development for the Head Start community. Founded in 1973.

Head Start: The Nation's Pride, a Nation's Challenge **(1990).** In anticipation of its 25th anniversary, NHSA convened a panel to develop recommendations to the federal government for Head Start in the 1990s. In this report, the panel reviews the achievements of Head Start in providing innovative early childhood services, highlights Head Start's benefits to children and discusses the progrm's future directions.

NHSA argues that Head Start has the potential to: serve as a model of comprehensive services; provide leadership in collaborative programs and research for the entire early childhood field; reach large numbers of children and families; and respond to their diverse needs. Yet funding falls far short and limits the full potential of the program. Adequate funding is critical to address the three major issues confronting Head Start: the need to protect quality; the need to expand enrollment and service delivery; and the need for leadership to promote collaboration and to launch new research.

To protect quality, Head Start needs funding to reflect the real per child expenditure for services; compensate and train qualified staff; and provide needed family support services. In terms of enrollment, programs need to serve more and younger children and to operate on a full-day basis. Income guidelines need to be more flexible and use of a sliding-fee scale would encourage economic self-sufficiency among Head Start families. In the areas of research and collaboration, federal leadership is necessary for follow-up studies of children as they move on to school and in funding initiatives with other early childhood and human-service providers and with the business community. The report recommends specific strategies to address each of these issues.

In conclusion, the report offers the following three principles for Head Start's future:

- It is a federal responsibility to ensure that adequate resources are available to meet the recommendations for program improvement and expansion.
- Head Start expenditures per child should be adequate to ensure program quality and flexible enough to meet local needs.
- Head Start expansion must be accompanied by the continuation, improvement and expansion of the other early childhood and human services low-income families need. □

"... our vision of Head Start includes an expanded enrollment and service delivery that is more responsive to such diversity.... We see Head Start becoming a model of quality, a catalyst for change and a source of innovation within a network of services for young children and families."

Head Start: The Nation's Pride, a Nation's Challenge, **1990**

National League of Cities

The National League of Cities (NLC) directly represents 49 state leagues of municipal officials and more than 1,400 cities, towns and villages and indirectly represents more than 17,000 municipalities. It serves as an advocate in Washington, D.C. for its members, pursues a national municipal policy agenda and provides training and technical assistance to municipal officials. Founded in 1924.

Making Government Work for Your City's Kids: Getting Through the Intergovernmental Maze of Programs for Children and Families **(1992).** This report was prepared for local elected officials to help them become better intergovernmental advocates for children and families. NLC sees the three major purposes of intergovernmental advocacy as: improve or better use existing programs and services; expand services by increasing the level of resources allocated; and reform or modify the way systems work.

NLC describes a dual crisis for the 1990s: children and families are in crisis and the programs in place to help children and families constitute a second crisis. These programs are narrowly focused and well meaning but unresponsive to the real needs of children and families. NLC detects a growing consensus that local government is best suited to address these dual crises in a humane and effective way because:

- The issues are more immediate. Local elected officials see the problems on their doorsteps.
- The interconnectedness of the problems is more readily apparent at the local level.
- Cities are already involved in providing many services and so have a real stake in greater efficiency and effectiveness.
- Local business leaders are directly affected as parents and employers so they have a personal stake in involvement at the local level.

After an overview of federal, state and local programs for families and children, the report provides guidelines for collaboration and service integration. NLC cautions that collaboration does not create resources and so cannot be a solution to the chronic underfunding of children's services. Rather it sees collaboration as a way to make services fit the needs of people. NLC recommends that municipalities need a mechanism of collaboration that can function as: a neutral and authoritative convener of all service providers; a change agent, able to provide incentives for collaboration through local discretionary resources; and an evaluator that uses child- and family-centered outcome measures to make programs fit together to meet real needs. Simultaneously, localities should: think families, not programs; think community, not jurisdiction; and stay focused on the goal of strengthening and nurturing families, not on programs or organizations.

Finally, NLC identifies seven steps for municipal officials who wish to improve service delivery for children and families:

- Create a visible, local focal point for children and family issues, such as a children's commission with staff, resources and a mechanism for follow through.
- Know the community, its resources and its needs. NLC suggests preparing a children's budget to identify services and resources for children and a resource inventory or a regulatory review to see what programs have an impact on children and families.
- Establish a children's agenda so that the whole community knows the plan of action and develop reliable indicators to measure outcomes.

"The failures of the current nonsystems to facilitate people helping people are most obvious at the delivery level. To local community leaders, the problems of program fragmentation have real faces; there are real families who are falling through the cracks."

***Making Government Work for Your City's Kids: Getting Through the Intergovernmental Maze of Programs for Children and Families*, 1992**

- Know the players and the systems, including service providers, businesses and elected officials at other levels of government.
- Network with advocacy groups and other communities to find out what has worked elsewhere.
- Push a children's agenda on all fronts—in speeches, meetings and conferences.
- Ask questions and take risks—a children's agenda requires people and organizations to think in new ways. □

***Caring for Children: Case Studies of Local Government Child Care Initiatives* (1989).** This report, prepared by Fern Marx, identifies child care as a dominant issue for parents, employers and public officials and calls for a national youth policy with four components:

- A Presidential Youth Cabinet to implement a national youth policy.
- Adequately funded early childhood development programs, pre- and post-natal health services for children and parenting-skills programs.
- Increased, affordable child care for infants, preschool and school-age children; support for research; and increased training and salaries for child care workers.
- Minimum federal standards on what constitutes high-quality, safe and affordable child care.

In addition to profiling 26 communities' child care programs, the report summarizes lessons learned from a survey of city officials:

- Strong leadership is an important element in each successful program.
- The federal government has an important role to play in financing child care.
- A strong focal point, such as a municipal child care coordinator, provides a mechanism for organizing quality service delivery.
- Child care is a priority for municipalities.
- City officials must respond flexibly to different ideas and changing conditions.
- Cities can be brokers in leveraging money and partnerships between various sectors of the community.
- The potential for success increases when the child care initiative is a citywide one.
- Schools and local government must cooperate.
- Cities can affect the quality of child care through their funding, technical assistance and regulatory and licensing procedures.
- Cities need well-thought-out plans and policies before developing municipal child care initiatives. □

National PTA

The National PTA, an organization with 7,000,000 members and local units in more than 25,000 schools, offers a large selection of materials designed to help parents become more involved in meeting the needs of families and children in their local schools and communities. Founded in 1897.

***Child Care: What Your PTA Can Do* (1990).** Recognizing that child care options for school-age children are generally inadequate, National PTA suggests the following actions for local PTAs to improve the availability and quality of school-age care:

- **Schedule a special meeting to discuss the needs of working parents and their children,** at which relevant National PTA resources can be distributed. The PTA can invite representatives from community agencies to describe the after-school activities offered in the community and make parents aware of employer-supported child care options that might be available to them.

- **Work with the school to increase the availability of school-age child care and ensure that latchkey children are safe.** The National PTA advises enlisting the cooperation of the principal, teachers, support staff and students to create a strong coalition in support of school-age child care. To determine the need for school-age child care in the community, the National PTA recommends using its community-survey form to conduct a survey of parents in cooperation with the school principal, school district or community agency. If there is a need for school-age child care, PTA members can encourage the school district to establish such programs, preferably based in public school buildings. PTA members should also consider whether the local PTA can establish and operate a school-age child care program. To teach children how to take care of themselves when they are home alone, PTAs can encourage schools to offer "survival skills training" to all students as a regular part of the curriculum and can conduct a safe babysitting campaign to help teenagers become better babysitters.

- **Work with community groups to mobilize a "keeping kids safe" campaign.** For example, PTA members can establish a block-parent program in cooperation with the police department, where selected adults place decals in their windows to signal that children can come to their home for help; set up a hotline or "warmline" for children who are home alone and need someone to talk to; work with the media to disseminate information about keeping latchkey kids safe and the need for school-age child care; conduct seminars at workplaces on school-age child care; inform businesses about their options in helping to meet the need for child care; and develop a directory of school-age programs and other after-school activities available in the community. □

***Looking In On Your School: A Workbook for Improving Public Education* (1982).** This workbook is a tool designed to help parents work with school leaders in determining the strengths

"PTAs can address the crisis in the care of school-age children. PTAs can establish block parent programs, after-school enrichment activities and school-age child care programs and can encourage employers to adopt policies to help meet the needs of families and more."

***Child Care: What Your PTA Can Do*, 1990**

and weaknesses of their local schools. It includes a checklist of questions grouped to evaluate key areas of school performance, including the goals and objectives of the school; administration; teachers; students; curriculum; support services; library/media or learning center facilities; the school plant; financing; and parents and community. The National PTA believes that evaluating schools will help isolate and improve weaknesses and suggests that all sectors of the community be involved in evaluating the school to get a true picture of the quality of education. After the evaluation is completed, the National PTA suggests the community carefully analyze the data to determine the schools' strengths and weaknesses and draft a plan of action for improving the schools. □

National School Boards Association

The National School Boards Association (NSBA), representing approximately 97,000 national and territorial school board members, promotes quality public education through the school board policymaking system. Founded in 1940.

***Link-Up: A Resource Directory* (1991).** This directory highlights the growing importance of collaborative programs in meeting the needs of children and families. NSBA contends that schools alone are not financially or professionally equipped to provide the social services many students need to succeed academically. Additionally, the growing numbers of children and families with unmet needs indicate that the existing social-service system is also not equipped to deal with the multiple problems facing many families. Although each individual service agency may offer quality services, the current system is not tailored to provide a comprehensive program that addresses all of a family's requirements. According to NSBA, these factors point to the need for collaboration to provide children and families with the services they need in an effective and efficient way.

Designed to help school board members and other education policymakers establish collaborations with other agencies, the directory includes brief descriptions of 171 collaborations already in operation in school districts across the country. It also provides specific information on questions policymakers should ask before initiating a collaboration, a discussion of some of the ways in which agencies can collaborate, suggestions on how to structure collaborations, a sample collaboration document, an example of how one collaboration dealt with the privacy issue, and a description of the role of the case manager.

NSBA argues that the public schools are an integral component in a successful collaboration because they have a responsibility to serve all children and are often the most accessible, appropriate and accountable institutions in children's lives. Additionally, if schools are held accountable for students' academic performance and preparation for the workplace, they have a vested interest in ensuring that other factors that impact learning are addressed. These factors make schools practically, politically and philosophically the right arena for coordination.

NSBA defines collaboration as a cooperative effort by parties with similar or overlapping objectives to reach goals that cannot be achieved by any party acting alone. According to the Education and Human Resources Consortium, of which NSBA is a member, there are five key elements to a successful collaboration: providing a wide array of prevention, treatment and support services; ensuring that children and families receive the support they need; focusing on the entire family; involving children and families in identifying the services they need; determining the approaches that will be most successful; and changing evaluation criteria to measure outputs rather than inputs.

Despite the critical need for collaborative efforts, they are often difficult to establish and maintain because they require a new way of making decisions. NSBA identifies other significant barriers to collaboration: the false perception that collaboration requires an increase in responsibility and a reduction in power; the time-consuming nature of the collaborative process; specific funding requirements that mitigate against or preclude collaboration; obstacles in collective bargaining agreements; and agency policies on confidentiality that prevent sharing of information.

Effective collaborations require major changes for schools and the agencies with whom they work. NSBA suggests policymakers consider the following prerequisites for collaboration: define the goal of the collaboration clearly and establish

"Schools are neither professionally nor financially equipped to provide the social services many students need to succeed academically. It will take a concerted—and coordinated—effort by all the agencies serving children, youth, and their families to solve the myriad of problems facing our nation's next generation."

***Link-Up: A Resource Directory*, 1991**

a shared vision of what needs to be accomplished; allow adequate time for planning; consider a variety of partners, such as private nonprofit organizations, universities and the business community; enlist the support of key leaders; build ownership at all levels; and establish policies that promote collaboration, provide needed support and promote equity among all partners. Recognizing that collaboration alone cannot solve all the problems facing children and families, NSBA believes it is a way to address complex needs in a comprehensive way. □

***Education Reform for the '90s: The School Board Agenda* (1990).** Detailing policy statements in five areas, including early childhood education, this report defines early childhood education as encompassing preschool (all pre-kindergarten child care and education programs), school-age child care and the K-three grade levels. The report cites two main developments that make early childhood education a major issue for school boards: criticism of the current academic curriculum in grades K-three and the needs of parents for quality child care.

The report makes five recommendations for school board action:

- **Consider early childhood education and child care as one integrated need.** Because few school systems can afford to accommodate all of the community's preschool needs, NSBA recommends that schools join in collaborative efforts with community, public and private groups and act as a referral agency or community clearinghouse for child care services.
- **Emphasize contact with families and secure full federal funding for comprehensive health and nutrition services for eligible children and their families.** NSBA recommends that, in conjunction with other public, health and education agencies, school boards establish prenatal contact with first-time, low-income and high-risk parents-to-be and offer a full range of parenting classes.
- **Eliminate barriers to early childhood education.** NSBA argues that raising the preschool, kindergarten or first grade entrance age disproportionately hurts low-income children, whose parents do not have the financial resources for private programs, by putting them in danger of falling farther behind their peers. NSBA advises that school boards avoid these practices in favor of providing appropriate learning experiences for all children.
- **Replace the traditional K-three program with an early childhood unit.** Instead of raising the kindergarten entrance age, NSBA recommends replacing the traditional program with a curriculum ensuring developmentally appropriate practices that take the child's individual needs into account. This would eliminate most paper-and-pencil workbook activities in favor of child-initiated activity.
- **Only hire teachers certified in the education of young children.** NSBA also recommends a national accreditation standard for programs. □

***Ready to Learn: Early Childhood Education and the Public Schools* (1990).** This report is intended to bolster local school boards' efforts to develop and implement early childhood programs that best serve the families in their communities. Providing school board members with information about early childhood programs, including recent local, state and national initiatives, the report describes the outcomes of quality programs and the key issues involved in their design. It also examines the primary players in a community who can and do serve young children, including the public schools, parents, social-service agencies and businesses.

NSBA believes that school districts have a stake in early childhood programs as they give children an enthusiasm for learning and positive attitudes toward school that can carry over into later grades. Early childhood programs can also offer parents a successful initial experience with the public school system. Additionally, NSBA contends that by meeting the child care needs of parents and attracting parents who might otherwise enroll their children in private programs, early childhood programs can broaden community support for public schools.

NSBA emphasizes the importance of collaboration in establishing early childhood programs and advises school boards to work closely with the early childhood community and other service providers to assess community needs and consider what the respective roles of the schools and other providers should be. Parents and business and community leaders should also be brought into the process of determining and fulfilling the community's vision of services for young children and families.

NSBA outlines some specific guidelines for action that school boards should follow in starting and maintaining a strong early childhood program:

- **At the community level.** School boards must increase public awareness about the need for comprehensive, affordable programs for young children. Additionally, school boards should consider setting up a community-wide planning council to conduct a needs assessment; identify the array of services needed for children and families; establish priorities; identify funding sources; develop a coordinated action plan; and make the community aware of the time commitment needed to establish a successful program.

- **Developmentally appropriate education.** School boards should develop a statement of philosophy, objectives and principles to provide an overall framework for the early childhood program; reevaluate the K-3 program for developmental appropriateness and continuity; assign leadership responsibility to an administrator with training in early childhood education; and encourage each school to educate parents about developmentally appropriate practices and the school's philosophy.

- **Parent involvement.** To build a strong parent involvement and family support component into the early childhood program, school boards should encourage the development of parent-education programs and support groups; include parents in committees and forums that elicit their input and contribute to self-confidence and empowerment; in cooperation with other groups, make routine home visits to build closer links between parents and schools; cooperate with social-service agencies and other groups to establish workable systems for sharing information about children and families in need of help; and develop long-term monitoring techniques to assess the effect of family programs.

- **Comprehensive, integrated services.** To provide these services to young children and families, school boards need to collaborate with other organizations in the community by participating actively in community coordinating bodies or taking the lead in forming one; working with existing early childhood programs in the community when planning

new public school early childhood initiatives; avoiding any action that undermines existing early childhood programs; working with other key agencies to set up before- and after-school child care in the schools; exchanging information with other service providers about how systems and agencies operate; advocating funding for resource-and-referral agencies; encouraging innovative family support services with linkages to the public schools; developing coordination and referral procedures with local health and social-service agencies to increase parents' knowledge and access to services; offering to make the schools a focal point for health and dental screening efforts; and providing time for school staff to work with relevant agency personnel and with families.

- **Staff.** On staff issues, school boards should become involved by supporting the improvement and expansion of early childhood preservice training at colleges and universities and encouraging the hiring of teachers with early childhood training and credentials; providing ongoing in-service training for teachers, administrators and others who work with pre-kindergarten children; encouraging joint staff-development sessions with staff from other early childhood programs in the community; supporting fair and equal compensation for public school early childhood teachers; setting standards for the maximum class size and staff:child ratio; and working to strengthen the prestige of early childhood educators within the public school community.

- **Facilities.** To provide a facility appropriate for early childhood education, school boards, together with school personnel and involved parents, should study the facility needs of early childhood programs; consider space in district schools which could be converted for preschool use; consider collaboration with another district or use of other facilities in the community; and search out funding sources from state and federal grants and loans or contributions from the private sector for renovation and construction.

- **Funding.** School boards have two roles to play in trying to increase funding for early childhood programs: encourage the financial and in-kind support of the private sector and work to increase the coordination and flexibility of funding streams at the local, state and federal level.

- **At the state and federal level.** School boards should monitor policymaking and legislative activity about children in general and at-risk children and families in particular. □

"Quality child care is educational; good education involves quality child care."

***Education Reform for the '90s: The School Board Agenda*, 1990**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Project Home Safe

Project Home Safe (PHS), a national education and advocacy program for children in self-care and their families, was developed by the American Home Economics Association with a grant from the Whirlpool Foundation to provide a range of community-based solutions to the problem of children at home alone. Founded in 1987.

***Developmentally Appropriate Practice in School-Age Child Care Programs* (1991).** This guide identifies the following principles and components of programming that reflect the characteristics and needs of school-age children:

- Developmentally appropriate school-age child care programs provide resourceful, caring staff who understand the changing role adults play in school-agers' lives.
- Such programs recognize the importance of peers to school-age children and youth.
- Both mixed-age grouping and same-age grouping are used to facilitate the development of peer relations and social skills.
- Self-selection, rather than staff selection, of activities and experiences predominates.
- Positive guidance and discipline techniques are used to help children and youth achieve self-control.
- Environments are arranged to accommodate children and youth individually, in small groups and large groups, and to facilitate a wide variety of activities and experiences.
- Activities and experiences offered contribute to all aspects of a school-ager's development. □

***Quality Criteria for School-Age Child Care Programs* (1991).** This report specifies quality criteria for school-age child care programs in the following areas: interactions among staff and children/youth; activities and experiences; staff-parent interaction; staff qualifications and development; administration; staffing; physical environment; health and safety; nutrition and food services; and evaluation. □

"Developmentally appropriate school-age child care programs are tailored to the developmental characteristics and needs of the children and youth they serve. Programs are mindful that children and youth change greatly during the school-age years and that the rate and nature of change vary considerably, both among children and youth and across developmental areas within the same child or youth. Programs approach these developmental realities as opportunities, rather than as problems."

***Developmentally Appropriate Practice in School-Age Child Care Programs*, 1991**

School-Age Child Care Project

The School-Age Child Care Project (SACCP), a nonprofit organization based at the Center for Research on Women at Wellesley College, conducts research and educates others on the need for quality school-age child care. Founded in 1979.

***Early Childhood Programs And The Public Schools* (1989).** This publication, authored by Anne Mitchell, Michelle Seligson and Fern Marx, focuses on the implications and recommendations of a three-year (1985-1989) study of public school early childhood programs conducted by Bank Street College and the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

The authors argue that the increasing demand for early childhood services stems from two interrelated factors. First, society's failure to educate the increasing number of disadvantaged children and, second, the growing demand for child care from families across the socioeconomic spectrum. As in the past, society is turning to the public schools to help meet the needs of young children and their families.

The authors cite several potential advantages of public school early childhood programs: greater affordability resulting from the tax base of support for public education; increased access because school buildings are located in every community; and possible improvements in quality because public school teachers are professional educators who traditionally hold special certification. However, the authors also point out the potential problems in public school early childhood programs: public funds for education are limited and far from secure; schools are often overcrowded rather than empty; and public school teachers are not trained to work with young children.

The authors report that in 1988, about one in five public school districts offered pre-school programs for children, utilizing different sources of funding and serving a variety of purposes. For example, primarily with federal funds, school districts operate Head Start programs and offer Chapter 1 services; using federal and state funds they provide education for preschool-aged children with handicaps and operate subsidized child care programs for low-income families; and primarily with parent fees, school districts operate full-working-day child care programs and part-day nursery schools for the community at large. The authors point out that the majority of state-funded pre-kindergarten programs are part-day, school-year programs for at-risk four-year-olds.

The authors outline several findings from the study that illustrate the state of public school pre-kindergarden programs.

- The administration of early childhood programs is changing as the practices and purposes of early childhood and child care programs are merging. Collaborations between state agencies that administer these programs, including education and social service departments, are being initiated.

- Every state is involved in some coordination effort; however, nearly all of these are limited to one program or one target population. Rarely do efforts encompass the full range of services for all children and their families.

- Public protection of children varies widely. Because state laws governing education were developed to govern programs for older children, they are, in many respects, neither appropriate nor adequate to guide programs for younger children.

- On ratios and group size, public school pre-kindergarten programs meet the accepted standards of the early childhood profession; findings on staff qualification are less clear.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"All parents want their children to have a good educational start; nowadays, most parents also want and need high-quality child care. As this nation begins to grapple with developing a large-scale response to these intertwined needs, community institutions of all sorts will have to mobilize to shoulder their share of responsibility for making high-quality early childhood programs widely available and readily accessible. Public schools are increasingly viewed as a major partner in that effort. However, as a nation, we are far from agreeing on the best route to providing early childhood services, whether with regard to a specific appraoch, scope, resources needed, or where the locus of control should reside."

***Early Childhood Programs And The Public Schools*, 1989**

Among all kinds of public school pre-kindergarten programs, just over half require teachers to have early childhood teacher certification.

- The quality of the environment and materials observed in the public school pre-kindergarten programs varied widely. There was a striking lack of basic early childhood equipment. Nearly one-fourth of the classrooms used developmentally inappropriate materials such as workbooks.

- Good early childhood education practices in pre-kindergarten programs did not permeate the rest of the public school setting.

- Most public school pre-kindergarten programs, with the exception of child care and Head Start programs, practice a form of parent involvement limited to parent-teacher conferences and occasional classroom volunteering.

- State-funded pre-kindergarten programs either do not address the issue of comprehensive services or address it only partially. Districts are generally not providing comprehensive services in their various programs for pre-kindergarten children.

- Competition for children, space and teachers exists between public school-operated and other kinds of pre-kindergarten programs.

The authors conclude that improving and expanding the capacity of the current early childhood system to create enough good programs for all young children will require stronger public commitment to children and families, concerted action from all levels of government, and the wise deployment of all the resources of the early childhood ecosystem. The early childhood ecosystem as a whole, including child care centers, nursery schools and child care homes operated under public, private or religious auspices, is the appropriate locus for expanding and improving services for children under five. Public schools, representing about 5 percent of all pre-kindergarten programs, are one of the many parts of the early childhood ecosystem that must be considered.

The authors make recommendations in the following areas.

- **Administration.** The primary purpose of an administrative structure should be to support and improve the quality of services delivered to children and families.

- **Finance.** Financing mechanisms for pre-kindergarten programs should be designed to encourage all parts of the early childhood community, including public schools, to participate as providers. Also, the conflicting requirements for various categorical funding sources must be reconciled so that eligible children can be served in a coherent and continuous manner.

- **Regulation.** Ideally, all programs for young children, regardless of funding source or operating auspice, should be covered by one regulatory system that promotes quality — both in the provision of services to children and in the monitoring and enforcement of the regulations. At a minimum, in regard to basic health, safety and building-code regulations, conflicting requirements among regulation systems should be reconciled.

- **Eligibility.** Among programs targeted to the same population, eligibility requirements should be made as similar as possible and any conflicting requirements reconciled. Expansion of publicly funded programs should be planned within the existing framework of early childhood programs in a given community, so that public funds are used to support those children most in need and to fill gaps in service — not to supplant existing services.

- **Coordination.** Both state- and local-level coordination are required and must be linked together. Broad representation in the process of planning new or expanded efforts must also be ensured.

- **Teachers.** State teacher-certification regulations, pre-kindergarten program guidelines and child care licensing standards for early childhood teachers should all require child-related coursework, student teaching and other direct experience specific to pre-kindergarten-aged children.

- **Children.** The guiding principles and philosophical base of the early childhood curriculum should be clearly articulated and communicated to all parents, teachers and administrators. A sufficient supply of equipment and materials appropriate for young children should be available for every classroom and arranged in identifiable learning centers to encourage children's independent use. These materials should be multi-racial and non-sexist. Physical activity using large muscles should also be an integral daily part of programs for young children.

- **Families.** Parent participation in early childhood programs should include a menu of components such as direct participation in children's education, a role in program governance, employment training and job counseling, parent education and other forms of participation that may be appropriate to the families whose children attend a specific program. □

***No Time to Waste: An Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care* (1989).** In this publication, SACCP discusses the need for quality school-age child care and the possible consequences for children and families if quality care is unavailable; the principal public- and private-sector partners in the provision of care; funding alternatives for school-age child care; and the characteristics of a quality program.

In addition, SACCP outlines a 15-point action agenda, intended to guide the development of quality school-age child care programs, that covers the role of corporations and federal, state and local governments; funding; licensing and regulation; staffing and training; coordination and administration; and quality control.

Generally, SACCP advocates for school-age child care for children age five-16 because of the increasing number of children who care for themselves before and after school. SACCP believes that these children may face more academic and developmental problems and may be more susceptible to peer pressure, for example, to experiment with drugs, than children who participate in supervised activities. For practical reasons, SACCP encourages public schools to provide space for programs but recommends a collaborative approach with other agencies, government and the private sector because: organizations with expertise in recreational and

other activities can continue to deliver them; collaboration enables agencies to share costs; and the wide range of children's ages and needs demands a greater array of activities than any one group can provide by itself. SACCP notes that the culture of a community is the ultimate determinant of the variety of programs offered and the extent of collaboration.

Although SACCP advocates increased federal and state funding for school-age child care, it believes the local community should have responsibility for public education campaigns about the need for such care and for coordinating it. Nongovernmental agencies should be involved in school-age child care; for example, businesses could participate in community outreach and actual provision of programs, and colleges and universities could exchange ideas for staff training programs. Finally, SACCP stresses the need for more research on latchkey children and the impact of school-age child care programs. □

"Latchkey arrangements on a day-in, day-out basis do not meet the developmental needs of school-age children as they navigate the passage from early childhood to adolescence."

***No Time to Waste: An Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care*, 1989**

Southern Early Childhood Association

The Southern Early Childhood Association (SECA), a professional organization with 16,000 members, works on behalf of young children and their families to develop and disseminate knowledge and understanding of young children. Founded in 1945.

Position Statements. SECA has issued a series of position statements for use in its advocacy efforts, including:

***Continuity of Learning for Four-to-Seven-Year-Old Children* (1990).** SECA believes that quality care and education should provide continuous, integrated experiences for children. The quality of care that four- to seven-year-olds receive is critical, affecting their lifelong disposition for learning. To promote quality care and education, SECA advocates the following principles:

- Children learn and grow as whole persons.
- Children learn through active engagement and through conversation and dialogue concerning their experiences.
- All children can learn and, given appropriate settings, want to learn.
- Children learn quickly when material is presented in meaningful ways at appropriate times.
- Children exhibit different learning styles.
- Children grow and develop through predictable stages, but at individual rates.
- Early childhood educators and caregivers need special training and education for working with young children, opportunities for growth and the chance to develop collegial relationships with others.
- Early childhood educators and caregivers should be interested in and skilled at studying children and should be decision makers about curriculum and practices.
- Early childhood settings should be homelike, limited in size and offer comfort, security and support.
- Curriculum should include a wide variety of topics and subjects.
- Educators should provide settings with a balance of large-group, small-group and individual activities and a rich variety of quality resource materials, and should make use of technology.
- Educators should encourage cooperative learning among children and value communication with parents.
- Educators should use a variety of appropriate assessment techniques rather than formal testing of children and should conduct assessment for the purposes of planning and improving programs for children rather than labeling them.
- Interagency coordination and cooperation are essential for the optimal education of children.
- Educators and caregivers must work for public awareness and acceptance of developmental programs. □

***Quality Child Care* (1986).** In this position statement, SECA identifies the following fundamental needs of children that must be met in quality care: feel that the situation is a safe and comfortable place to be in; learn to feel good about themselves; be fully employed in activities that are meaningful; develop the ability to live

"Child care lasts all day long, five days a week, twelve months a year. It is the environment in which most of the child's waking hours are spent. The quality of that care is of vital consequence."

***Quality Child Care*, 1986**

comfortably with other children and adults; have physical development supported and learn health, nutritional and safety practices; and feel there is consistency in their lives and a shared concern for them among the important people in their lives—parents and caregivers. Under each category of need, SECA then identifies significant indicators of quality. SECA also reiterates its position in support of licensing for all child care programs. □

***Quality Four-Year-Old Programs in Public Schools* (1986).** In this pamphlet, SECA advocates that public school programs serving four-year-olds be appropriately designed. It identifies the characteristics of four-year-olds; describes the types of activities and experiences that should be incorporated into programs; and outlines quality program standards and also practices that quality programs should avoid. Basically, SECA sees quality public school programs for four-year-olds as an available opportunity and an attainable goal. □

***Supporting Parents* (1986).** SECA takes the position that stable, secure and growing families are indications of a society reaching for excellence and states that family effectiveness rests on two elements: quality parenting and a support system that enables family members to carry out their roles. To help parents be more effective, SECA recommends the following community supports: recognition that parenting is important and is a shared responsibility of the community; education for parenthood as part of the school curriculum; quality medical care for all family members; quality child care and productive school environments that support the total development of children and parents; and family support in the form of adequate housing, food, emotional support and security. □

***Developmentally Appropriate Education Experiences for Kindergarten* (1984).** In this pamphlet, SECA identifies the characteristics of kindergarten children and describes the learning environment appropriate for this age group. □

United Way of America

The United Way of America (UWA) is the national service and training center for the 2,300 community-based United Way organizations throughout the U.S. Although the organization has existed in various forms since 1887, the national office was officially established in 1982.

***Position Statements* (1991).** The United Way Board of Governors' position statement on early childhood development is based on the rationale that the U.S. must invest in its children to ensure a healthy and vital human resource base. UWA identifies a national strategy with the following key elements: collaborations and coalitions among the public, voluntary and private sectors to coordinate services and resources to meet the needs of families as a whole; a continuum of comprehensive, coordinated and good-quality services, which are also accessible and affordable, to meet the health and developmental needs of children and families; the highest priority on early intervention and prevention of problems; parental input in designing a comprehensive service package; a national commitment to universal access to preschool education; and business involvement in the development of services to ensure that future workforce needs will be met.

In terms of a more specific public policy agenda, UWA's Public Affairs Committee identified five issues as top priority for national, state and local action:

- Access for all at-risk children to Head Start or an equally effective alternative early childhood development program.
- Access for all children of working parents to full-day, developmental child care programs that are affordable and of high quality.
- Access for all low-income pregnant women to prenatal care and access for all low-income children to preventive and corrective medical care.
- A breaking down of the barriers to comprehensive service delivery to children and families through flexible funding arrangements and coordination/integration of services.
- Access for all low-income pregnant women and young children to the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Children and Infants (WIC). □

***Promising Prevention Programs for Children* (1991).** This report, prepared by the Urban Institute for the United Way Strategic Institute, describes selected effective prevention programs for children at risk (birth to age 15) and identifies common elements of these programs. After reviewing the literature, conducting site visits and studying formal program evaluations, the Institute concludes there is strong evidence that high-quality early childhood programs lead to: short-term improvements in cognitive, motor and social skills; mid-term benefits, such as being retained in grade less often and having fewer special education placements; and long-term benefits, such as fewer high school dropouts,

"Both rigorous research and community practice indicate that there *are* successful programs and models to enrich the lives of the nation's disadvantaged children and to help them become successful members of society. Prevention programs aimed at young children and their families are important investments in America's future."

***Promising Prevention Programs for Children*, 1991**

reduced delinquency and lower welfare participation.

The report also presents preliminary findings about measures of quality for home-visit parent education programs and family support programs. □

U.S. Chamber of Commerce: Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education

The Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education (CWPQE), an affiliate of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, was created to mobilize business leadership for a national grassroots education reform movement. Founded in 1990.

Improving the Business of Education **(1991).** This report provides readers with a model of school reform that seeks to involve the whole community in the effort. Recognizing that the poor state of education in America is seriously affecting the nation's businesses, the report calls for changes in American education spearheaded by those who have the highest stake in an educated workforce—the business community. CWPQE focuses on a comprehensive approach to education reform, believing that searching for and implementing long-term goals and solutions are the most effective ways to change the education system.

The report does not blame school systems alone for the failure to provide children with quality education; rather, it recognizes that a rapidly changing society, in which traditional support systems are crumbling, has had a marked and damaging effect on education. Because of multiple factors contributing to education failure, the report stresses the need to involve all members of the community in education reform.

The report proposes that business people, especially with the support of a well-established organization like the Chamber of Commerce, have the necessary organization skills, ties to the community and first-hand experience with education to find a solution. This report walks the reader through each step in the process of working for education reform, stressing the need to examine thoroughly each recommendation for reform before taking any specific action.

Additionally, CWPQE advocates that a committee determine the most pressing problems facing a school system and make recommendations for action to the community. The implementation phase should begin only after full discussion within the community. Although this process may be somewhat lengthy, CWPQE believes it achieves more significant education reform in the long run. □

"Comprehensive education improvement today presents community leaders a challenge of almost unparalleled complexity....Yet, this challenge of leading has to start somewhere, with some individual making the first move—becoming the initial catalyst, the Starter."

Improving the Business of Education**, 1991**

AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) administers all federal elementary, secondary and higher education programs. Established in 1978.

***America 2000* (1991).** America 2000 is the Bush Administration's long-range strategy to move the United States toward the six National Education Goals developed by the President and the Governors at the National Education Summit in September 1989. Although America 2000 was formulated by the President and his advisors, the federal government's role in America 2000 is restricted to setting standards, highlighting examples of successful school-reform initiatives, allowing flexibility in exchange for accountability, and contributing some limited funding. America 2000 relies primarily on state government and local communities to carry out individual education-reform initiatives.

The America 2000 strategy has four goals or "tracks":

- Improve the nation's 110,000 schools and make them more accountable.
- Design a "new generation of American schools" that will meet the educational demands of the next century.
- Create a "nation of learners" by encouraging adults already in the work force to continue to enhance their knowledge and skills.
- Look beyond schools into communities and families and make each one a place where learning can happen.

In this report, DOE outlines steps for local communities to follow in implementing these four goals. The plan for Goal 1 is based on a 15-point accountability package designed to encourage parents, teachers, schools and communities to measure results in education, compare results and insist on change when the results are not satisfactory. Some of the more critical or controversial steps are:

- **World-class standards.** Establish standards in the five core subjects that will function as benchmarks for what students should be expected to know and be able to do when graduating from high school.
- **Achievement tests.** Design nationwide voluntary tests tied to the world-class standards that will evaluate students' knowledge in the five core subjects. Colleges and employers will be urged to use the tests in admissions and hiring.
- **Report cards.** Provide clear and comparable information on how schools, school districts, states and the nation are performing. Beginning in 1994, Congress will be asked to authorize a regular assessment of progress in the five core subjects through data collection in grades four, eight and 12.
- **Choice.** Allow parents to select the school, public or private, their child will attend.
- **School as the site of reform.** Grant authority to teachers, principals and parents to make important decisions about how the school should operate. Congress will be asked to enact education-flexibility legislation to remove federal constraints that impede the ability of states to spend education resources most effectively.
- **Merit schools program.** Recognize schools that make notable progress toward the National Education Goals by offering federal monetary rewards.
- **Differential pay for teachers.** Reward teachers who teach well, teach core subjects, work in dangerous or challenging settings, or serve as mentors for new teachers.

"To help achieve the readiness goal, federal agencies must sharpen their efforts to serve young children and their families, and support interagency collaboration in planning, development, research, and evaluation."

***Preparing Young Children for Success: Guideposts for Achieving Our First National Education Goal*, 1991**

The first step in achieving Goal 2 of the America 2000 strategy, creating a new generation of American schools, is to organize design teams of experts who will help communities develop non-traditional schools designed to meet the National Education Goals and world-class standards. The design teams will be funded by private resources raised by the New American Schools Development Corporation, a nonprofit organization made up of business leaders. The America 2000 expectation is that this new generation of American schools will cost the same to operate as traditional schools.

A key element in developing the new generation of American schools, and in the America 2000 strategy overall, is America 2000 communities. These are communities that choose to meet the challenge of the six National Education Goals, develop a community-wide strategy to achieve the goals, design a report card to measure results, and plan for and support a new American school. The Governors will designate America 2000 communities, which will be recognized and rewarded by the President and the Administration with one-time grants of $1 million for start-up costs. At least one new American school will be created in each congressional district by 1996.

Goal 3 of the America 2000 strategy seeks to make the U.S. a nation of learners by encouraging adults to "go back to school" to learn to be better parents, neighbors, citizens and friends.

Goal 4 relies on the families, religious institutions, neighborhood associations, community organizations and voluntary groups that make up American communities to create communities where learning can happen. □

***Preparing Young Children for Success: Guideposts for Achieving Our First National Education Goal* (1991).** This report, one of several publications released by DOE detailing different aspects of the America 2000 strategy, discusses the various objectives of the school-readiness goal and proposes policies and practices that will enable communities to prepare young children for school. Although the recommendations center on a child's life before entering school, they also incorporate the school years up to age eight.

Objective one of the readiness goal focuses on ensuring disadvantaged and disabled children access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs that help prepare children for school. To realize this objective, the report proposes that states and localities begin by offering high-quality education and care in a variety of settings, including the home, school, workplace, family day care, child care centers, churches, synagogues, libraries and other community settings. Other critical steps to achieving objective one are linking community resources, assessing needs and progress, and improving educational practice.

Objective two emphasizes the role of parents in a child's physical, emotional, social and educational development. To help parents understand more clearly the role they play in educating their children, enhance their knowledge of child development, improve their child-rearing skills, and increase ties between schools and families, the following steps are recommended: 1) encourage parents to meet the challenge of parenting by

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

setting a good example and becoming more involved in the daily lives of their children; and 2) provide support to families through a variety of family support and education programs.

Objective three highlights the importance of good nutrition and health care, including prenatal care for mothers, in preparing children for school. To ensure that all children arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, the report advocates: 1) linking health and education efforts; 2) setting priorities to provide a continuum of care and meet comprehensive needs; and 3) improving service delivery.

Although many of the actions described above rely on state governments, the family and community for successful implementation, the report specifies that the federal government has a unique role to play in helping to achieve the readiness goal. Currently, the federal government supports many preschool education and child care programs, and prenatal care and health services. It also provides leadership, technical assistance and support for program services, research and evaluation. However, to further progress towards the readiness goal, the report recommends that federal agencies increase their efforts to serve young children and families and support interagency collaboration. Federal officials must also play a role by removing barriers to collaboration across programs, providing incentives for integrating services, and empowering parents to define and direct the selection of early childhood services. Overall, federal agencies must be held accountable for achievement of the National Education Goals, including routine assessment of progress toward the goals. □

Appendix I: Chart of National Organizations' Policy Positions

	affordability	availability	financing	governance/ oversight	school-age child care	parent choice/ involvement	integration of services	linking care & education
American Assoc. of School Administrators	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
American Federation of Teachers	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓
Assoc. for Childhood Education International	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Assoc. for Supervision & Curriculum Development	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
Business Roundtable	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching				✓		✓	✓	✓
Center for the Future of Children	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Child Care Employee Project	✓	✓	✓					
Children's Defense Fund	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Child Welfare League of America	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Committee for Economic Development	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
Conference Board								
Council of Chief State School Officers	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓
Council of Governors' Policy Advisors			✓	✓			✓	
Council of the Great City Schools	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Education Commission of the States			✓	✓		✓	✓	
Families and Work Institute	✓	✓				✓		✓
Family Resource Coalition	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Institute for Educational Leadership			✓			✓	✓	
NAB, Center for Excellence in Education			✓					
Nat'l. Assoc. of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nat'l. Assoc. for the Education of Young Children	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓
Nat'l. Assoc. of Elementary School Principals	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Nat'l. Assoc. of State Boards of Education	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Nat'l. Black Child Development Institute	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Nat'l. Child Care Association	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		
Nat'l. Coalition for an Urban Children's Agenda			✓	✓			✓	
Nat'l. Commission on Children	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Nat'l. Conference of State Legislatures	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓
Nat'l. Council of Jewish Women	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Nat'l. Education Association	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Nat'l. Education Goals Panel			✓					
Nat'l. Elementary School Center							✓	
Nat'l. Governors' Association	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Nat'l. Head Start Association	✓	✓	✓				✓	
Nat'l. League of Cities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Nat'l. PTA		✓			✓	✓		
Nat'l. School Boards Association	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Project Home Safe					✓	✓	✓	
School-Age Child Care Project	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓
Southern Early Childhood Association	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
United Way of America	✓					✓	✓	
U.S. Chamber of Commerce								
U.S. Dept. of Education		✓	✓			✓	✓	

role of schools	role of R&R agencies	role of private sector	quality	staffing/ training	licensing/ accreditation	proposals for action	
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	American Assoc. of School Administrators
✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	American Federation of Teachers
✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	Assoc. for Childhood Education International
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	Assoc. for Supervision & Curriculum Development
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	Business Roundtable
✓		✓	✓			✓	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	Center for the Future of Children
✓		✓		✓		✓	Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning
			✓	✓		✓	Child Care Employee Project
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Children's Defense Fund
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Child Welfare League of America
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	Committee for Economic Development
		✓					Conference Board
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	Council of Chief State School Officers
		✓				✓	Council of Governors' Policy Advisors
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	Council of the Great City Schools
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	Education Commission of the States
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Families and Work Institute
✓			✓	✓		✓	Family Resource Coalition
✓		✓		✓			Institute for Educational Leadership
✓		✓				✓	NAB, Center for Excellence in Education
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Assoc. of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies
			✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Assoc. for the Education of Young Children
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	Nat'l. Assoc. of Elementary School Principals
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	Nat'l. Assoc. of State Boards of Education
✓			✓	✓		✓	Nat'l. Black Child Development Institute
✓		✓	✓				Nat'l. Child Care Association
✓			✓	✓		✓	Nat'l. Coalition for an Urban Children's Agenda
✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Commission on Children
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Conference of State Legislatures
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Council of Jewish Women
✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Education Association
							Nat'l. Education Goals Panel
✓		✓		✓		✓	Nat'l. Elementary School Center
✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Governors' Association
		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. Head Start Association
✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. League of Cities
✓		✓	✓			✓	Nat'l. PTA
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nat'l. School Boards Association
✓			✓	✓			Project Home Safe
✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	School-Age Child Care Project
✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	Southern Early Childhood Association
		✓	✓			✓	United Way of America
		✓				✓	U.S. Chamber of Commerce
✓		✓	✓	✓			U.S. Dept. of Education

Appendix II: Bibliography of Publications

Following is a comprehensive list of the publications reviewed for inclusion in the Policy Digest. Those indicated with an asterisk are summarized in the Digest. Contact the organizations directly (See Appendix II for addresses and phone numbers) for complete publication lists or to order reports.

American Association of School Administrators

America 2000: Where School Leaders Stand (1991)
* *Beyond the Schools: How Schools & Communities Must Collaborate to Solve the Problems Facing America's Youth (1991)*
Let's Discuss the Issues: AASA Position Statements (1991)
* *Some Points to Make When You Talk About the Summit (1990)*
* *Early Childhood Education and Child Care: Challenges and Opportunities for America's Public Schools (1989)*
Challenges for School Leaders (1988)
Partnerships: Connecting School and Community (1986)
Schools of the Future (1985)
Business and Industry: Partners in Education (1984)

American Federation of Teachers

* *State of Emergency for Children in Crisis - News Release (1992)*
* *"The Case for Public School Sponsorship of Early Childhood Education Revisited"* (1987)
Putting Early Childhood and Day Care Services into the Public Schools (1976)

Association for Childhood Education International

Are Schools Ready for Kids?, Childhood Education Magazine (1991)
Personalizing Care with Infants, Toddlers and Families (1990)
* *The Right to Quality Child Care (1988)*
Preparation of Early Childhood Teachers (1983)

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

* *A Resource Guide to Public School Early Childhood Programs (1988)*

Business Roundtable

* *The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education (1991)*
  Essential Components of a Successful Education System (1990)
  The Business Role in State Education Reform (1990)

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

* *Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation (1991)*

Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation

* *The Future of Children, School-Linked Services, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Spring 1992)*

Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning

* *Mapping the Policy Landscape: What Federal and State Governments Are Doing to Promote Family-School-Community Partnerships (1992)*
* *School and Family Partnerships (1992)*
* *A Portrait of Schools Reaching Out: Report of a Survey of Practices and Policies of Family-Community-School Collaboration (1991)*

Child Care Employee Project

* *The National Child Care Staffing Study: Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America (1989)*

Children's Defense Fund

* *Helping Children by Strengthening Families (1992)*
  An Opinion Maker's Guide to Children in Election Year 1992 (1991)
* *The State of America's Children 1991 (1991)*

Child Welfare League of America

* *Building Early Childhood Systems: A Resource Handbook (1991)*
  Child Welfare League of America Standards of Excellence for Child Day Care Service (1991)

Committee for Economic Development

* *Business Impact on Education and Child Development Reform (1991)*
* *The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education (1991)*
  An America That Works: The Life Cycle Approach to a Competitive Work Force (1989)
* *Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged (1987)*

Conference Board

* *Corporate Support of the National Education Goals (1991)*

Council of Chief State School Officers

* *Families in School: State Strategies and Policies to Improve Family Involvement in Education (1991)*
  Community Education: A Guide for State Initiatives (1989)
* *Family Support, Education and Involvement: A Guide for State Action (1989)*
* *Restructuring Schools: Potential for Students at Risk (1989)*
* *Early Childhood and Family Education: Analysis and Recommendations of the Council of Chief State School Officers (1990)*
  Early Childhood & Family Education: Foundations for Success (1988)
  A Guide for State Action: Early Childhood & Family Education (1988)

Council of Governors' Policy Advisors

* *Strengthening Families: A Guide for State Policymaking (1991)*

Council of the Great City Schools

* *Strategies for Success: A Plan for Achieving the National Urban Education Goals (1991)*
* *Results 2000: Progress in Meeting Urban Education Goals (1990)*
  The Condition of Education in the Great City Schools - A Statistical Profile 1980-1986 (1986)

Education Commission of the States

Confidentiality and Collaboration: Information Sharing in Interagency Efforts: A Joint Publication of Joining Forces, American Public Welfare Association, Center for Law and Social Policy, Council of Chief State School Officers and Education Commission of the States (1992)

Education Commission of the States Series, *Restructuring the Education System* (1992)
Introduction to Systemic Education Reform
Building Private Sector Support and Community Support
Creating Visions and Standards To Support Them
Bringing Coherence to State Policy

* *"All Kids Can Learn," State Education Leader, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 1991)*
School Restructuring: What the Reformers Are Saying (1991)
* *Exploring Policy Options to Restructure Education (1991)*
* *The Education Agenda 1990 (1990)*
Education Finance in the 1990s (1990)
* *Every Child a Learner: Reducing Risks of Learning Impairment During Pregnancy and Infancy (1990)*
School Finance at a Glance (1990)
* *Sharing Responsibility for Success (1990)*
Configuring the Education System for a Shared Future: Collaborative Vision, Action, Reflection (1988)
Drawing in the Family: Family Involvement in the Schools (1988)
Collaboration: Teamwork to Get Things Done (1987)
* *Family Diversity and School Policy: Youth at Risk (1987)*

Families and Work Institute

* *The Private Sector as a Partner in Early Care and Education (1990)*
The Role of the Corporation in Promoting Early Childhood Education and Care and Family Support Systems (1990)

Family Resource Coalition

* *Programs to Strengthen Families: A Resource Guide, 3rd ed. (1992)*
* *Helping Families Grow Strong: New Directions in Public Policy (1990)*
Family Resource Program Builder: Blueprints for Designing and Operating Programs for Parents (1986)

Institute for Educational Leadership

* *Serving Children and Families Effectively: How the Past Can Help Chart the Future (1991)*
* *Thinking Collaboratively: Ten Questions and Answers to Help Policy Makers Improve Children's Services (1991)*
* *What It Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families with Comprehensive Services (1991)*
* *New Partnerships: Education's Stake in the Family Support Act of 1988 (1989)*
* *The Same Client: The Demographics of Education and Service Delivery Systems (1989)*
All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten through Graduate School (1985)

National Alliance of Business

The Compact Project: Final Report (1991)
* *Center for Excellence in Education - News Release (1990)*
Corporate Action Agenda: The Business of Improving Public Education (1990)

National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies

* *A Hitchhiker's Guide to the Child Care Universe (1992)*
* *Child Care Crossroads (1991)*
* *Two Visions: The Future of Day Care and Early Childhood Programs (1989)*

National Association for the Education of Young Children

Guidelines for Appropriate Curriculum Content and Assessment in Programs Serving Children Ages 3 Through 8: A Position Statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (1990)
* *NAEYC Position on School Readiness (1990)*
Guiding Principles for the Development, Analysis and Implementation of Early Childhood Legislation (1989)
* *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children From Birth Through Age 8 (1987)*
* *Accreditation Criteria & Procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs (1984)*

National Association of Elementary School Principals

* *Early Childhood Education and the Elementary School Principal: Standards for Quality Programs for Young Children (1990)*

National Association of State Boards of Education

Wish...Stories of Children Growing Up in Washington, D.C. (1992)
* *Caring Communities: Supporting Young Children and Families (1991)*
* *Joining Forces: A Report from the First Year (1989)*
* *Right from the Start: The Report of the NASBE Task Force on Early Childhood Education (1988)*
Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival: A Call to Restructure Schools (1989)

National Black Child Development Institute

The Status of African American Children: Twentieth Anniversary Report 1970-1990 (1990)
* *Safeguards: Guidelines for Establishing Programs for Four-Year-Olds in the Public Schools (1987)*
* *Child Care in the Public Schools: Incubator for Inequality? (1985)*

National Child Care Association

* *Perspective on Publicly Funded Pre-K Child Care Programs in the Public Schools (1991)*

National Coalition for an Urban Children's Agenda

* *Implementing the Children's Agenda: Critical Elements of System-Wide Reform (1991)*

National Commission on Children

* *Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families (1991)*
  Speaking of Kids: A National Survey of Children and Parents (1991)

National Conference of State Legislatures

* *Child Care and Early Childhood Education Policy: A Legislator's Guide (1989)*

National Council of Jewish Women

Highlights of the NCJW National Family Day Care Project 1988-1992 (1991)
* *The Hard Questions in Family Day Care: National Issues and Exemplary Programs (1990)*

National Education Association

* *NEA Mobilizes for Action: Advancing the Nation's Education Agenda (1991)*
* *Early Childhood Education and the Public Schools (1990)*

National Education Goals Panel

* *The National Education Goals Report: Building a Nation of Learners (1991)*

National Elementary School Center

Expanding the Role of the School (1989)
* *The School as Locus of Advocacy for All Children (1988)*

National Governors' Association

* *Every Child Ready for School (1992)*
* *Educating America: State Strategies for Achieving the National Education Goals (1990)*
Policy Positions: 1990-91 (1990)
* *Results in Education: 1990 (1990)*
State Actions to Restructure Schools: First Steps (1990)
Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts (1989)
Early Experience in Restructuring Schools: Voices from the Field (1988)
* *Time for Results: The Governors 1991 Report on Education (1986)*

National Head Start Association

* *Head Start: The Nation's Pride. A Nation's Challenge (1990)*

National League of Cities

* *Making Government Work for Your City's Kids (1992)*
* *Caring for Children: Case Studies of Local Government Child Care Initiatives (1989)*

National PTA

Coalitions: Joining Them, Building Them and Making Them Work (1991)
* *Child Care: What Your PTA Can Do (1990)*
* *Looking In on Your School: A Workbook for Improving Public Education (1982)*

National School Boards Association

* *Link-Up: A Resource Directory (1991)*
* *Education Reform for the '90s: The School Board Agenda (1990)*
* *Ready to Learn: Early Childhood Education and the Public Schools (1990)*
Day Care in the Public Schools (1986)

Project Home Safe

* *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in School-Age Child Care Programs (1991)*
  Matching School-Age Child Care with Your Child's Needs (1991)
* *Quality Criteria for School-Age Child Care Programs (1991)*

School-Age Child Care Project

* *Early Childhood Programs And The Public Schools: Between Promise and Practice (1989)*
* *No Time to Waste: An Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care (1989)*
  School-Age Child Care: An Action Manual (1982)

Southern Early Childhood Association

* *Continuity of Learning for Four-to-Seven-Year-Old Children (1990)*
  Platform for Children (1988)
* *Supporting Parents (1986)*
* *Quality Child Care (1986)*
* *Quality Four-Year-Old Programs in Public Schools (1986)*
* *Developmentally Appropriate Educational Experiences for Kindergarten (1984)*

United Way

Mobilization for America's Children (1991)
* *Position Statements on Early Childhood Development, Health Care & Education and Literacy (1991)*
* *Promising Prevention Programs for Children (1991)*
  Success by Six (1990)

U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education

Education: Our Nation's Business (1991)
* *Improving the Business of Education (1991)*
  Teaching Tomorrow's Workforce (1990)
  Public Attitudes Toward Education - The Roper Poll (1990)

U.S. Department of Education

America 2000 Communities: Getting Started (1992)
* *America 2000: An Education Strategy (1991)*
* *Preparing Young Children for Success: Guideposts for Achieving Our First National Education Goal (1991)*

Appendix III: Organizations Included in Policy Digest

American Association of School Administrators
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209-9988
Phone: (703) 528-0700 or (703) 875-0730

American Federation of Teachers
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001-2079
Phone: (202) 879-4458

Association for Childhood Education International
11501 Georgia Avenue
Suite 315
Wheaton, Maryland 20902-1924
Phone: (800) 423-3563

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
1250 North Pitt Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1403
Phone: (703) 549-9110

Business Roundtable
200 Park Avenue
Suite 2222
New York, New York 10166
Phone: (212) 682-6370
Washington Office:
1615 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 872-1260

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
5 Ivy Lane
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Phone: (609) 452-1780

Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
300 Second Street
Suite 102
Los Altos, California 94022
Phone: (415) 948-3696

Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Phone: (410) 516-0370

Child Care Employee Project
6536 Telegraph Avenue
Suite A201
Oakland, California 94609
Phone: (510) 653-9889

Children's Defense Fund
25 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 628-8787

Child Welfare League of America
440 First Street, NW
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20001-2085
Phone: (202) 638-2952

Committee for Economic Development
477 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 688-2063
Washington Office:
2000 L Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 296-5860

Conference Board
845 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 759-0900 *or* (800) USA-BOARD

Council of Chief State School Officers
1 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 408-5505

Council of Governors' Policy Advisors
400 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 390
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 624-5386

The Council of the Great City Schools
1413 K Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 371-0163

Education Commission of the States
707 17th Street
Suite 2700
Denver, Colorado 80202-3427
Phone: (303) 299-3692

Families and Work Institute
330 Seventh Avenue
14th Floor
New York, New York 10001
Phone: (212) 465-2044

Family Resource Coalition
200 South Michigan Avenue
Suite 1520
Chicago, Illinios 60604
Phone: (312) 341-0900

Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 822-8405

National Alliance for Business
Center for Excellence in Education
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-3917
Phone: (202) 289-2900

National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies
P.O. Box 40246
Washington, D.C. 20016-0246
Phone: (507) 287-2220

National Association for the Education of Young Children
1509 16th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (800) 424-2460

National Association of Elementary School Principals
1615 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3483
Phone: (703) 684-3345

National Association of State Boards of Education
1012 Cameron Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 684-4000

National Black Child Development Institute, Inc.
1023 15th Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 387-1281

National Child Care Association
1029 Railroad Street
Conyers, Georgia 30207
Phone: (800) 543-7161

National Coalition for an Urban Children's Agenda
c/o National Association of State Boards of Education
1012 Cameron Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 684-4000

National Commission on Children
1111 Eighteenth Street, NW
Suite 810
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 254-3800

National Conference of State Legislatures
1560 Broadway
Suite 700
Denver, Colorado 80202-5140
Phone: (303) 830-2200
Washington Office:
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 624-5400

National Council of Jewish Women
53 West 23rd Street
New York, New York 10010
Phone: (212) 645-4048

National Education Association
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 822-7350

National Education Goals Panel
1850 M Street, NW
Suite 270
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 632-0952

National Elementary School Center
2 East 103rd Street
New York, New York 10029
Phone: (212) 289-5929

National Governors' Association
444 North Capitol Street
Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20001-1572
Phone: (202) 624-5300

National Head Start Association
201 North Union Street
Suite 320
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 739-0875

National League of Cities
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: (202) 626-3000

National PTA
700 North Rush Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611-2571
Phone: (312) 787-0977

National School Boards Association
1680 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 838-6722

Project Home Safe
1555 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 706-4600

School-Age Child Care Project
Wellesley College
Center for Research on Women
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181
Phone: (617) 235-0320 x2500

Southern Early Childhood Association
P.O. Box 5403
Little Rock, Arkansas 72215-5403
Phone: (501) 663-0353

United Way of America
701 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2045
Phone: (703) 683-7830

U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Center for Workforce Preparation and Quality Education
1615 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20062
Phone: (202) 463-5525

U.S. Department of Education
America 2000
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202
Phone: 1-800-USA-LEARN (1-800-872-5327) or (202) 401-2000

Appendix IV: Additional Resource Organizations

American Academy of Pediatrics
141 Northwest Point Boulevard
Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60009
Phone: (708) 228-5005

American Home Economics Association
1555 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 706-4600

American Public Welfare Association
810 First Street, NE
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20002
Phone: (202) 682-0100

Association of Child Advocates
Victor Village Place
Suite 101
10 East Main Street
Victor, New York 14564
Phone: (716) 924-0300

Association of Junior Leagues International
660 First Avenue
New York, New York 10016
Phone: (212) 683-1515

Association of Teacher Educators
1900 Association Drive
Suite ATE
Reston, Virginia 22091-1599
Phone: (703) 620-3110

Bank Street College
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10025
Phone: (212) 875-4400

Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy
Yale University
310 Prospect Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511-2188
Phone: (203) 432-9935 or (203) 432-9944 (School of the 21st Century)

Center for Choice in Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Room 3053
Washington, D.C. 20202
Phone: (800) 442-7425

Center for Educational Innovation
Manhattan Institute
52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Phone: (212) 599-7000

Center for Educational Leadership
99 Hudson Street
9th Floor
New York, New York 10013
Phone: (212) 219-4600

Center for Law and Social Policy
1616 P Street, NW
Suite 450
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 328-5140

Center for Policy Alternatives
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 710
Washington, D.C. 20009
Phone: (202) 387-6030

Center for School Change
Humphrey Institute
University of Minnesota
301 19th Avenue South
Room 209
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Phone: (612) 625-3506

Center for the Study of Social Policy
1250 Eye Street, NW
Suite 503
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 371-1565

Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools
1025 West Johnson Street
Room 659
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Phone: (608) 263-7575

Chapin Hall Center for Children
University of Chicago
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Phone: (312) 753-5900

Child Care Law Center
22 Second Street
5th floor
San Francisco, California 94105
Phone: (415) 495-5498

Children's Foundation
725 15th Street, NW
Suite 505
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 347-3300

Cities in Schools, Inc.
1333 Emerson, NW
Washington, D.C. 20011
Phone: (202) 882-1091

Citizens' Education Center
310 First Avenue, South
Suite 330
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 624-9955

Committee for Hispanic Children and Families, Inc.
140 West 22nd Street
Suite 302
New York, New York 10011
Phone: (212) 206-1090

Developmental Studies Center
111 Deerwood Place
Suite 165
San Ramon, California 94583
Phone: (415) 838-7633

Ecumenical Childcare Network
1580 North Northwest Highway
Suite 111
Park Ridge, Illinios 60068
Phone: (708) 298-1612

ERIC/Educational Resources Information Center
ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education
University of Illinois
805 West Pennsylvania Avenue
Urbana, Illinois 61801-4897
Phone: (217) 333-1386

ETS Policy Information Center
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08541-0001
Phone: (609) 734-5694

Education and Human Services Consortium
c/o Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20036-5541
Phone: (202) 822-8405

Family Focus
310 South Peoria Street
Suite 410
Chicago, Illinios 60607
Phone: (312) 421-5200

Generations United
c/o Child Welfare League of America
440 First Street NW
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20001-2085
Phone: (202) 638-2952

Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Longfellow Hall, Appian Way
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Phone: (617) 495-9108

Head Start Bureau
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
P.O. Box 1182
Washington, DC 20013
Phone: (202) 205-8572

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48198
Phone: (313) 485-2000

Home and School Institute, Inc.
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 466-3633

Institute for American Values
1841 Broadway
Room 211
New York, New York 10023
Phone: (212) 246-3942

Institute for Responsive Education
605 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
Phone (617) 353-3309

National Assembly of National Voluntary Health and Social Welfare Organizations, Inc.
1319 F Street, NW
Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: (202) 347-2080

National Association of Counties
440 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 393-6226

National Association for Family Day Care
725 Fifteenth Street, NW
Suite 505
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 347-3356 or (800) 359-3817

National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education
Mary E. Carr, President
Early Childhood and Child Care Programs
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building, FG11
P.O. Box 42700
Olympia, Washington 98504-7200
Phone: (206) 586-2263

National Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators
Doris Fromberg, President
School of Education
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York 11550
Phone: (516) 463-5779

National Association of Partners in Education, Inc.
209 Madison Street
Suite 401
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 836-4880

National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091
Phone: (703) 860-0200

National Center for Children in Poverty
Columbia University
154 Haven Avenue
3rd Floor
New York, New York 10032
Phone: (212) 927-8793

National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching
Teachers' College
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
Phone: (212) 678-3432

National Child Day Care Association
1501 Benning Road, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4599
Phone: (202) 397-3800

National Coalition of Advocates for Students
100 Boylston Street
Suite 737
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
Phone: (617) 357-8507

National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education
ASPIRA Association
1112 16th Street, NW
Suite 340
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 835-3600

National Committee for Citizens in Education
900 Second Street, NE
Suite 8
Washington, D.C. 20002-3557
Phone: (202) 408-0447

National Community Education Association
801 North Fairfax Street
Suite 209
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-6232

National Congress of Parents and Teachers
National Learning Foundation
11 Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20036-1271
Phone: (202) 797-0065

National Educational Service
1610 West Third Street
P.O. Box 8
Bloomington, Indiana 47402
Phone: (800) 733-6786

National Resource Center on Family Based Services
University of Iowa
School of Social Work
112 North Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52242-1223
Phone: (319) 335-2200

National Urban League, Inc.
1111 14th Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 898-1604

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20208-5641
Phone: (202) 219-1513 or (800) 424-1616

Parents as Teachers National Center
9374 Olive Boulevard
Saint Louis, Missouri 63132
Phone: (314) 432-4330

Progressive Policy Institute
316 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Suite 555
Washington, D.C. 20003
Phone: (202) 547-0001

Public Education Fund Network
601 13th Street, NW
Suite 290 North
Washington, D.C. 20005-3808
Phone: (202) 628-7460

Research for Better Schools
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123
Phone: (215) 574-9300 ext. 280

School and Family Connections Project
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Phone: (410) 516-0370

Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families
U.S. House of Representatives
385 House Office Building, Annex 2
Washington, D.C. 20515-6401
Phone: (202) 226-7660

United Nation's Children's Fund (UNICEF)
3 U.N. Plaza
New York, New York 10017
Phone: (212) 326-7000

U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, NW
4th floor
Washington, D.C. 20006
Phone: (202) 293-7330

William T. Grant Foundation
Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 301
Washington, DC 20036-5541
Phone: (202) 775-9731

Zero to Three/The National Center for Clinical Infant Programs
2000 14th Street North
Suite 380
Arlington, Virginia 22201-2500
Phone: (703) 528-4300

Child Care Action Campaign
Board of Directors

Honorary Chairmen
President Jimmy Carter
President Gerald R. Ford

Founding President
Elinor Guggenheimer

President
Richard B. Stolley
Time Inc.

Vice-Presidents
Dana E. Friedman, Ed.D.
Families and Work Institute
Kate Rand Lloyd
Sandra Salyer
Mervyn's
Francine Sommer
First Security Management, Inc.

Secretary
Judith Kauffman Fullmer
Citibank

Treasurer
Thomas J. Volpe
Interpublic Group of Companies, Inc.

General Counsel
Gaines Gwathmey, III
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison

Executive Director
Barbara Reisman

Hans H. Angermueller
Shearman & Sterling

Susan Aronson, M.D.
Fellow, American Academy of Pediatrics

Helen Blank
Children's Defense Fund

Ronald E. Blaylock
Utendahl Capital Partners

Myrna Blyth
Ladies' Home Journal

T. Berry Brazelton, M.D.
Harvard Medical School

Roger H. Brown
Bright Horizons Children's Centers

Vivian Cadden
Working Mother Magazine

Bettye M. Caldwell, Ph.D.
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

John Mack Carter
Good Housekeeping

William R. Chaney
Tiffany & Co.

Sey Chassler

Roxanne J. Coady
R.J. Julia Booksellers, Ltd.

Matilda Cuomo
State of New York

Ricki Fairley-Brown
Reckitt & Colman, Inc.

Ellen Galinsky
Families and Work Institute

Gary David Goldberg
UBU Productions

Peter L. Harris

Betty Hudson
NBC, Inc.

Marlene Johnson

Sheila B. Kamerman, D.S.W.
Columbia University School of Social Work

Arnold Kroll
Wertheim Schroder & Co. Inc.

Eliot Lehman
FEL-PRO, Inc.

Jacqueline Leo
Family Circle

Patricia S. Lieberman
A.L. Mailman Family Foundation

Lynn Lyss
National Council of Jewish Women

Julia Hines Mabus

Jane Macon
Fulbright & Jaworski

Kristin A. Mannion
PaineWebber

Jay Mazur
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union

Gerald McEntee
AFSCME, AFL-CIO

Evelyn Moore
National Black Child Development Institute

Gwen Morgan
Wheelock College

Sondra L. Murphy
New York Women's Foundation

Arthur L. Novell
Markham/Novell Communications, Ltd.

Bea Romer
State of Colorado

Herman Sillas
Ochoa & Sillas

James Strickland
Child, Inc.

Pierre M. Sutton
Inner City Broadcasting Corp.

Dee Topol
Primerica Foundation

Bernice Weissbourd
Family Focus, Inc.

Edward Zigler, Ph.D.
Bush Center, Yale University

CCAC PUBLICATIONS

Where They Stand: A Digest of Organizational Policies on Child Care and Education

A comprehensive guide for policymakers and advocates to 45 national organizations' policy positions on quality child care, early childhood education and education reform. Highlights the common ground and differences among organizations' approaches and the need for more collaboration. (1993) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

Building Links: Developer Initiatives for Financing Child Care

The second of a series of reports on financing alternatives for child care examines the ways in which communities have begun to involve real estate developers in providing child care. (2nd edition, 1993) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

Investing in the Future: Child Care Financing Options for the Public and Private Sectors

Identifies key barriers faced by family day care and center providers to obtaining start-up and operating financing. The report highlights successful financing models, including grants and loans, bank reinvestment strategies, community initiatives, bonds, pension funds, and employer partnerships. (1992) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

Insuring Your Future: Liability Insurance and Child Care

Offers child care providers comprehensive information about designing a child care liability insurance package to suit their needs. The Guide describes the types of policies available, profiles 25 insurance companies nationwide that offer liability policies and includes a glossary of insurance terms. (1992) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

An Employer's Guide to Child Care Consultants

Guides employers through the search for a child care consultant focusing on: the reasons for using a child care consultant; services that consultants can offer; how to choose the child care consultant that best fits their needs; and resources for locating child care consultants. (1992) ☐ $15 non-member ☐ $10 member

Not Too Small to Care: Small Businesses and Child Care

Profiles 29 small businesses (employing under 250 workers) that have implemented child care benefits: on- or near-site child care centers, employee subsidies, flexible work hours, parental leave, family day care homes and Dependent Care Assistance Plans. (1991) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

Making the Connections: Public-Private Partnerships in Child Care

Highlights 20 successful and innovative partnerships for child care between private business, voluntary organizations and public agencies. (2nd edition, 1991) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

Child Care Currents

Provides an overview of the child care crisis, including a discussion of demand, marketing, and financing methods for child care. (1990) ☐ $10 non-member ☐ $6 member

Employer Tax Credits for Child Care: Asset or Liability?

Examines the effectiveness of state tax breaks to employers for child care. Includes interviews and the analysis of quantitative data. (1989) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

Child Care: The Bottom Line

Focusses on child care as an economic issue. Analyzes the costs and benefits of increased investment in child care by the public and private sectors. (1988) ☐ $25 non-member ☐ $15 member

---

MEMBERSHIP & PUBLICATIONS

YES, I would like to become a CCAC Member!

CCAC Members receive our trendsetting bi-monthly newsletter, **Child Care ActioNews**, access to our 28 up-to-date Information Guides and discounts on CCAC's groundbreaking publications.

☐ Individual $25 ☐ Contributing $35☐
Family $50
☐ Organization $100 ☐ Corporation $250☐
Leadership Circle $1000

Please send the following CCAC publications:

Quantity	Price	
_____	_____	Where They Stand: A Digest of Organizational Policies on Child Care and Education
_____	_____	Investing in the Future: Child Care Financing Options
_____	_____	Insuring Your Future: Liability Insurance & Child Care
_____	_____	An Employer's Guide to Child Care Consultants
_____	_____	Not Too Small to Care: Small Businesses and Child Care
_____	_____	Making the Connections: Public-Private Partnerships in Child Care
_____	_____	Building Links: Developer Initiatives for Financing Child Care
_____	_____	Child Care Currents
_____	_____	Employer Tax Credits for Child Care: Asset or Liability?
_____	_____	Child Care: The Bottom Line

Total Amount Enclosed: $_____

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Card Number _____

Expiration Date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Organization/Company _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Phone _____

(Please allow 4-6 weeks for delivery.) Please mail your check or money order with this form to:
Child Care Action Campaign, 330 Seventh Ave., 17th fl., New York, NY 10001